Thomas Michael Leome

ESSAYS

FROM THE *DUBLIN REVIEW*.

By W. G. WARD, D.Ph.

ESSAYS

ON DEVOTIONAL AND SCRIPTURAL SUBJECTS.

BY

WILLIAM GEORGE WARD, D.PH.

[*Reprinted from the* DUBLIN REVIEW.]

LONDON: BURNS & OATES.
1879.

LONDON:
WYMAN AND SONS, PRINTERS, GREAT QUEEN STREET,
LINCOLN'S-INN FIELDS, W.C.

TO HIS EMINENCE

The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL,

It was only natural and reasonable on my part to ask your permission, that I might have the privilege of inscribing your Eminence's name in my first volume of republished Essays. Had it not been for my official connection with the "Dublin Review," I should never have had sufficient energy to pursue a sustained course of intellectual work for so many years; and my official connection with the "Dublin Review" is entirely owing to you. In saying this, I refer not only to my original appointment, but much more to your repeated encouraging assurances in my times of special anxiety and despondency. I can never forget your most considerate kindness on such occasions.

It was a great gratification to me—as time went on and one important controversy after another claimed attention—to find that, in every case, the line which I proposed to take received your Eminence's approval and sanction. I need only refer under this head to the questions which successively arose, concerning Infallibility and the Church's whole doctrinal authority—concerning the due relations of Church and State—concerning the Holy Father's Civil Princedom—concerning English Catholic University, and

again College, Education. But this volume itself contains an stance in point. The publication of Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon was a very anxious fact, as regards the effect which might be produced on the general English mind by his extracts—sometimes mutilated, never duly exhibited in their full context—from the language of authoritative Catholic writers concerning the Most Holy Virgin. I felt that a great responsibility was incurred by me, as to the proper method of encountering this invidious and perilous attack. And it was a most welcome relief to find, that you approved and confirmed my own humble judgment on the proper line to be taken.

I have only referred to the personal and comparatively unimportant question, of the relations which have existed between your Eminence and myself. I have confined myself to this, because of course it would be unbecoming and impertinent for one in my position, to express in detail his sense of the services rendered by your Eminence to Holy Church, in so many different ways and on such momentous occasions.

Begging your Eminence's blessing,

I remain,

My dear Lord Cardinal,

Your affectionate servant,

W. G. WARD.

PREFACE.

My reason for this publication is very intelligible. Various things have been said by me from time to time in the "Dublin Review," of which I desire to keep alive the memory, in order that such of them as are true may have better chance of being ultimately accepted by Catholic public opinion. But (practically and generally speaking) no one reads the back numbers of a periodical. And accordingly I am sanctioned in this kind of republication, by such names as that of Cardinal Wiseman among Catholics; of Lord Macaulay, Carlyle, Stuart Mill, among externs. The present volume then is intended as the first of a brief series. I need not trouble the readers with my reasons for beginning with the particular Essays here presented; though every one (I think) will see, that they are united together by a certain general unity of subject. But I would draw special attention to that which stands first, and which is the longest of all. I shall be able

better to explain the drift and significance of this Essay, if I may be permitted here a certain general reference to my personal history.

No other feature in Catholic devotion and doctrine is commonly so repulsive to pious Protestants, as the prominence habitually given to the thought of our Blessed Lady, and the very important position which that thought occupies in the whole interior life. I cannot say that for myself I ever felt any keen distress at this, such as was felt by some others, immeasurably my superiors, who nevertheless ultimately abandoned Anglicanism for the Catholic Church. Still there are certain particulars in Catholic devotion to the Most Holy Virgin, which, at the time of my conversion, were felt by me as difficulties; though I accepted them (as was surely most reasonable) on faith. At a very early period however of my Catholic life, what appeared (and appears) to me the true rationale of those particulars, presented itself to my mind. I heard it said by Catholics on all sides of me, that Mary is the way to Jesus, as Jesus is the way to the Father. Let this statement be taken—not as a vague generalization or rhetorical

exaggeration—but as the literal truth, and then the whole matter (I came more and more to think) is clear enough. I came more and more to hold, that Catholic devotion to our Blessed Lady, even in the extremest shape which it wears among authorized and approved writers, does but legitimately develop the dogma of the Incarnation. I came indeed more and more to hold, that any lower and less prominent devotion to her implies a deficient apprehension of that central Christian dogma, as regards its reasonable practical results. And conversely I came more and more to hold, that the objections commonly brought against the Catholic cultus of Mary—if they had any relevance at all—would be equally, nay in a still greater degree, relevant against the Christian worship of Jesus.

Such having been my state of mind in 1865, when Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon appeared, I read with quite intense interest those parts of his work which treated this particular theme. Here I found brought together all the most "extreme" passages discoverable by a very unusually well-read critic, who had evidently worked at his task with a will; and I might fairly assume therefore, that those passages

were pretty well the strongest existing. I found that, with one single exception, there was no person who in the widest sense of the term could be called an authorized or approved writer, whose statements — when examined from the point of view I had reached —did not admit (I will not merely say of a satisfactory, but in general) of a most easy explanation. Concerning the one exception, I will speak presently. Otherwise those very citations of Dr. Pusey's, which he took for granted would most startle his readers, were (when read in their context) to me full of charm and edification. I said several times in the "Dublin Review," that I had to thank him sincerely for bringing many of these passages for the first time to my knowledge. More than one Anglican critic indeed represented this, as a piece of what I may call controversial swagger and effrontery; but it was the literal truth. I have to thank his book for giving me a more detailed (if I may so speak) and more intelligent devotion to our Blessed Lady, than I had before; and I have found this a great blessing.

It was of course my business, as Editor of the "Dublin Review," to deal controversially with Dr. Pusey. I had thus an excellent op-

portunity for putting into shape, what had so long been working in my mind; and the result was the Essay of which I am now speaking. I have thought it better, even at the risk of tediousness, to republish this Essay in its full original length. I have done this, because it seems so important not to content myself with laying down general principles, but to confront every one of those passages, which Dr. Pusey (and presumably therefore any other objector) accounts the most intolerable. If there is any Protestant who is indignant at these "extreme" statements —or any English Catholic who is perplexed by the language of his brethren in other lands—I would with great deference entreat such a person to give me a fair hearing. I would with great deference entreat such a person to ponder what is urged by me in the Essay, which I here again submit to the public judgment. In particular I would entreat him to ponder on this—not as though it were on my part a more or less ingenious controversial tour de force,— but on the contrary as representing my very sincere and rooted conviction. I venture to submit, that it is the advocates of these devotions, and not the Anglican denouncers of them, who are more genuinely loyal to the dogma of

the Incarnation. I venture to submit, that, of all possible doctrines concerning our Lord's Mother, that which Dr. Pusey calls "Marianism" is the one most emphatically Christian.

I have already admitted, that there is one Catholic writer of real weight and authority, whose language offers to my mind grave difficulty. I refer to that admirable man M. Olier; whose words, as cited by Dr. Pusey, will be found in p. 85 of this volume. The difficulty is, that these words seem intended, not as rhetorical and affective, but as accurate and doctrinal expressions. M. Olier seems to lay down as a *doctrine*, that our Blessed Lord, after His Resurrection, put aside much of His tender love for sinners; and that what had hitherto been His particular office in that respect, was thenceforward filled by our Blessed Lady. Now it is most remarkable, that this very passage of M. Olier's, instead of weakening my case, rather strengthens it. My argument in the Essay is this. If Dr. Pusey could maintain his thesis—if those writers whom he calls "Marian" could be reasonably understood as meaning by their language, that our Blessed Lord feels less tenderness towards sinners than His Mother does—so much the worse for

Dr. Pusey himself. If such a supposition were well founded, then by exact parallel (or even à fortiori) Dr. Pusey's own habitual language concerning our Lord would be reasonably understood as meaning, that God the Father feels less tenderness for sinners than does God the Son. Now, most remarkably, this latter is in substance the very statement which M. Olier makes, if his words are to be taken doctrinally. He lays down, that the Father feels far less tenderness towards sinners, than did Jesus before His Resurrection. He says that "the disposition" of "the Father towards sinners" is "to reject them." He says that the severity of attitude towards them, which he (M. Olier) ascribes to Christ Risen, is no other than that attitude towards them, which he considers to have been the Father's throughout all Eternity. I am as unable now as I was in 1866, to conjecture how it is that such a person as M. Olier can have thus written. But the fact of his *having* done so, strongly supports my thesis as to the close analogy which exists, between the relation of Jesus to Mary on one side, and the relation of the Father to Jesus on the other. The same habit of mind (whatever it may be) which led M. Olier to unsound statements on the former relation, led him to even

more seriously unsound statements on the latter. And at last of course—however great may be M. Olier's just authority with Catholics,—it must be remembered that he is not one of those (such as S. Alphonsus and Grignon de Montfort) whose writings have been authoritatively approved, with a view to prospective canonization.

I have been stating frankly, what is the general thesis which I desired to establish in the first Essay of this volume. At the same time I earnestly trust that I have nowhere used language at all inconsiderate towards those Protestants—many of them most pious and excellent men—who are repelled or painfully perplexed by the expressions of authoritative Catholic writers. Certainly I have been anxious to defend the Church against the very serious charge, that she sanctions any devotion of idolatrous tendency. But then I cannot think that the genuine conversion of Protestants would be promoted, by *pleading guilty* to such a charge. And I trust that such language as I have used in p. 197, note,—which I am sure my readers will admit to be a fair sample of my general tone,—will vindicate me against any accusation, of pressing persons forward with in-

opportune urgency, at the risk of scandalizing and repelling them. It seems to me that there are among Protestants two widely different tempers of mind, which claim at a Catholic's hand widely different treatment. Those who—as though seated on some lofty eminence,—look down upon the Church, and criticise her words and acts with self-complacent compassion or contemptuousness, can hardly rank among those "little ones" of Christ, to whom the most unremitting tenderness and considerateness is a Catholic's bounden duty.

In my Second short Essay—or rather collection of fragments—nothing will be found, except this or that practical application of the principles defended in the First. I will here only refer to pp. 116—122, as setting forth at greater length what I intended to imply in my earlier language (p. 82), on Grignon de Montfort's special and characteristic devotion.

Of my third Essay—mainly written under the guidance of F. Harper's great treatise—I may perhaps say without impropriety that, on reading it again after a long interval, I am much impressed by its contents. I am greatly struck by what seems to me the strength of the Scriptural and historical arguments adducible, for

those prerogatives of our Blessed Lady which the Catholic Church testifies. I may add however (as I have already implied) that it was not on such reasonings, that my own convictions on the subject had been based. In fact, until the Eirenicon appeared, I had given no systematic attention at all to this particular aspect of the controversy; though well knowing of course its great importance. For instance I was entirely unaware of the great patristic argument concerning the Second Eve, which was so magnificently sketched by Cardinal Newman, and was filled up by F. Harper with such singular completeness and effectiveness. Under any circumstances indeed, the patristic argument for doctrines is one external to my own sphere of direct knowledge, and which I could only set forth at second hand. In fact, had not F. Harper's treatise appeared in the very nick of time, that particular portion of my reply to Dr. Pusey must have been a very jejune affair. But I must confess more than this. At the time of the Eirenicon's appearance, I had never pondered, with anything like due attention, the great promise of God, recorded in Gen. iii. 15, on which I speak in pp. 173–176 of the present volume. When I was led, by the publications

of Cardinal Newman and F. Harper, to meditate more carefully on this prophecy, I came more and more to see its amazing significance. It seems to me—as I argue in pp. 175, 6—that those expressions of Montfort which so startled and offended Dr. Pusey, were really *a good deal short* of what would reasonably and legitimately be inferred, from this (as it has been called) "Protevangel." Certainly it is most remarkable—in view of the controversy which has been raised in later times—that (as I urge in p. 176) God's "first promise of a Redeemer was (as it were) imbedded in His promise of a Co-Redemptress." And there is a second fact, almost equally remarkable: viz. that (as Cardinal Newman has pointed out) the whole body of patristic and traditional theology, concerning our Blessed Lady, has been mainly built on this very text. It would seem then, that it is devotion to our Blessed Lady in its *modern* dress, which is more truly accordant than any other with Scriptural and patristic intimations. I need hardly add how deeply it interested me, to find this new and unexpected light thrown on my earlier convictions.

There is one other particular in the Third Essay, to which I would here refer. I had learned

from my old friend F. Faber a special attachment to the doctrine, that our Blessed Lady was not only exempt from original sin, but exempt also from the "debitum proximum" of contracting that sin. In other words I had learned to be greatly out of sympathy with the statement, that she "sinned in Adam." This, I need hardly say, is an entirely open question among Catholics; and both Cardinal Newman and F. Harper are on the side opposite to F. Faber's. I was very naturally therefore desirous to obtain a hearing for the doctrine so dear to me, and on this account I defended it in some detail. In my present republication however, I have thought it better greatly to abridge my remarks on the subject. See pp. 159–163.

The stir made by the Eirenicon elicited an admirable popular treatise from Dr. Northcote, on "Mary in the Gospels." I took occasion by this treatise to develop somewhat further—under Dr. Northcote's guidance—the Scriptural argument, on which I had previously touched. This article stands Fourth in the present volume.

The Fifth Essay—on the Sacred Heart—(in addition to its intrinsic interest, whatever that may be) has a very real connection with the

four which precede. The charge commonly adduced by Anglicans against the Catholic Church is, that she practically gives a subordinate place to the worship of Jesus Christ, by encouraging such a multitude of devotions to His Mother. The primitive worship of Jesus, they allege, is buried in modern times beneath the cultus of our Blessed Lady. And behold on examination it appears, that a large proportion of those who adduce the charge, are themselves profoundly ignorant what *was* the primitive worship of Jesus. So ignorant are they of this, that when they contemplate a certain Catholic devotion, which is new indeed in form, but proceeds on the exact lines of primitive doctrine,—they cry out against it, as being unsound if not actually heretical.

The remaining Essays of the volume are not so closely connected with each other, as are the five first; though (as I have said) I hope they will be accounted to possess a certain general unity of subject. In the Sixth I am not attempting any investigation whatever of the place held by S. Paul, in reference to God's plan for evangelizing all nations. Such an investigation has just been commenced by F. Coleridge in the "Month," and promises to be of extreme

interest. But my own purpose is entirely negative. I merely aim at showing, that there is nothing in S. Paul's recorded history, inconsistent with the Catholic doctrine concerning the Church's hierarchical unity and monarchical government. There are various facts in S. Paul's Life, which non-Catholic Christians understand as implying anti-Catholic doctrine; and my only purpose is, to exhibit those facts in what seems to me their true light.

The Seventh and Ninth Essays speak sufficiently for themselves; but I will say a few words on the Eighth and Tenth. I had unusually great pleasure in writing them, most poor and inadequate though I felt them to be, towards expressing what I intended. Under any circumstances it was a great duty to press F. Coleridge's Commentary on the attention of Catholics; and the rather because—as he is Editor of the "Month"—that periodical was precluded from doing the volumes justice. But further I have personally quite an extraordinary drawing to them. They realize and more than realize an idea, which had been in my mind for many years, as to the kind of commentary on the Gospels, which seemed to me beyond all others urgently called for. I had long felt

what I have expressed in p. 369 of this volume; the unnatural divorce which seemed in some sense to exist, between Scriptural and ascetical teaching. It had struck me also, that comparatively inadequate stress is commonly laid on the singular and unapproached position occupied by the Gospels,—in comparison with all other literature of every other kind—as recording the very words and deeds of Almighty God. On the other hand my own intellectual gifts are not such, as to give me any power whatever of remedying the evil; and it was a kind of new sensation to me, when I came across F. Coleridge's method of dealing with the subject. It was at my suggestion, that he began a series of articles on the Gospels in the "Dublin Review," which circumstances prevented him from carrying further in that particular shape. May God grant him health, strength, and opportunity, to carry on his noble work to its due close!

In republishing these ten Essays, I have made various verbal changes, for the purpose of explaining more clearly what I meant, or filling up the gap caused by an omission, or softening down those exaggerations of language which (I am told by every one) are conspicuous among my many defects as a writer. Wherever I have

made a greater change than this—which occurs however very rarely—I have taken care to mark the fact in a note. These newly added notes are readily distinguishable, by the circumstance that they are included within brackets, and are expressed in the first person singular.

I trust I may be pretty confident, that there are no serious theological errors in the volume. The original articles were submitted to the three censors of the "Dublin Review"; and what little is now added, has also been submitted to competent censorship. But by far the largest number of my various statements turn upon questions, which are confessedly open ones. On these matters, I venture to hope firstly, that those Catholics are not very few, who will for the most part agree with me. And I hope also secondly, that in many cases those who repudiate my way of solving some given question, may nevertheless think I have done good service in raising and arguing such question.

Ascension Day, 1879.

CONTENTS.

PREFACE . . . . . *page* vi

ESSAY I.—CATHOLIC DEVOTION TO OUR BLESSED LADY.

The allegation to be encountered in this Essay is, that Catholic devotion to Mary obscures the thought of Jesus . . 1
What are the doctrines implied in those devotions to Mary which the Church inculcates? 5
On what ground does a Catholic accept these doctrines? . 9
Objection considered, that to regard Mary as knowing men's thoughts is to regard her as divine 11
The special objection brought by Dr. Pusey against the Catholic devotion to Mary 13
This objection exhibited in methodical shape . . . 15
An entirely similar objection may be brought by an Unitarian, against the Christian worship of Jesus 17
The answer to this latter objection, which would be given alike both by Anglicans and Catholics 21
A precisely parallel answer is available to Catholics against Dr. Pusey 26
The case considered of those, who, while recklessly plunged in mortal sin, practise devotion to Mary . . . ib.
The case considered of those, whom Montfort calls "presumptuous devotees" of Mary 27
The case considered of those, who practise devotion to Mary, being still in mortal sin but wishing themselves free from it 30
The case mainly contemplated by Dr. Pusey, of those who

practise devotion to Mary, being on the whole free from mortal sin, but not saintly or interior men. This case considered in some detail . . . . . *page* 31
Mary has no special "character" of her own, any more than her Son has 35
To dwell in thought on the recorded facts of Mary's life, is to dwell in thought on the mysteries of Jesus . . . 36
Prayers offered by such Catholics as we are considering, to Mary and to Jesus respectively 37
The sensible devotion felt by such Catholics, towards Mary and towards Jesus respectively 43
The thought of Mary secures in such Catholics the remembrance of her Son's Divine Personality 46
Passages considered, in which Mary is represented by Catholic writers as the special hope and refuge of sinners . . 47
Does any Catholic *confine* his prayers to Mary? . . . 50
The allegation considered, that prayers for a non-Catholic's conversion are more commonly offered to Mary than to Jesus . . . . . ib.
The case considered (1) of interior and (2) of saintly men, as regards their devotion to Mary 51
Such men are compelled, by the very necessity of their nature, to seek rest and satisfaction in the thought of the Infinite . . . . . ib.
Does Catholic devotion to Mary encroach on the mediatorial office of Jesus? 52
It is plain on the surface, that no Catholic regards Mary as divine 54
Certain other doctrines, not magisterially inculcated by the Church, are nevertheless universally held by devout servants of Mary . . . . . ib.
Mary's office as Mother of perseverance 55
Consideration of the common dictum, that devotion to Mary is a very special note of predestination 56
Certain further propositions have been advocated by individual holy men, with the Church's full toleration . . . 61
The proposition, that Mary is our Co-Redemptress. . . 64

The proposition, that Mary appeases her Son's just anger *page* 66
The vision of the two ladders 67
The proposition, that God has committed to her the kingdom of mercy, reserving to Himself the kingdom of justice . 68
The proposition, that Mary is mediatrix between Jesus and men 71
The proposition, that Mary commands her Son . . . 73
The habit, exhibited by various holy men, of paralleling in detail Mary's history with that of Jesus: her Assumption e.g. with His Ascension 78
The proposition, that every privilege should be ascribed to Mary, which can be ascribed to her without theological error 79
The desire, expressed by Montfort and others, for a great increase in the devotion to Mary . . . . . ib.
Individual writers:
S. Alphonsus 84
S. Bernardine of Sienna 85
M. Olier . . . . . ib.
Salazar 87
Ven. Grignon de Montfort 91
Summary of what has been said in the Essay . . . 98
Great importance of there being scope, in devotional exercises, for men's capacity of loving finite objects . . . 99
Criticism of certain replies which have been made to the preceding Essay 101

ESSAY II.—FRAGMENTS ON CATHOLIC DEVOTION TO OUR BLESSED LADY.

Mgr. Dechamps on the Second Eve 105
Controversy with Anglicans concerning devotion to Mary . 107
F. Jeanjacquot, S.J., on Mary as the Co-Redemptress and the Mother of Christians 111
Montfort's special and characteristic devotion . . . 11

ESSAY III.—CATHOLIC DOCTRINES CONCERNING THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

F. Harper's treatise on the Immaculate Conception . *page* 124
The allegation to be encountered in this Essay is, that the Catholic doctrines concerning Mary are at variance with Scripture and Antiquity 127
There are two most opposite rudimental views concerning Mary . . . . . ib.
One of these is asserted by the vast majority of Protestants . 128
The other is harmoniously testified throughout Scripture and Tradition 129
The legitimate consequence of this latter is, that in every age there shall be an increasing ascription to Mary of every high privilege 131
The Immaculate Conception 132
What is implied by the fact of a dogma being defined as of faith? 134
The Catholic dogma on original sin 136
What is meant by the dogma of the Immaculate Conception? 141
Objections against this dogma, derived from Scripture . . 144
Objections against this dogma, derived from Antiquity . . 145
F. Harper's summary on the teaching of Antiquity . . 157
Did Mary sin in Adam? 159
The doctrine of her Assumption 164
The condemned error, that Mary is co-present with Jesus in the Eucharist 167
Certain doctrines, concerning Mary, are implied in the devotional practices which the Church inculcates . . 170
On what ground does the Catholic accept these doctrines? . 171
Objections alleged from Scripture against these doctrines . 173
Significance of God's great prophecy, recorded in Gen. iii. 15. ib.
Other Scriptural testimonies 176
Objection considered, that in the Gospels there is comparatively little mention of Mary 181
Objection considered, that in the Epistles Christians are not exhorted to invoke Mary 186

Objection considered, that Antiquity is comparatively silent on the invocation of Mary . . . . . *page* 191
Peace through the truth 196

ESSAY IV.—MARY IN THE GOSPELS.

Importance of Dr. Northcote's argument 198
His remark on the Protestant ignorance of theology . . 201
Mary in prophecy 203
Dr. Northcote's remark, that Mary forms a class by herself in the hierarchy of created beings 206
Jesus spent by far the largest portion of His earthly existence in obedience to Mary and closest intimacy with her . 208
Objection considered, that she was greatly separated from Him during his public life 210
Her demeanour at His Crucifixion 211
She, before any other, saw Him Risen 212
His permanent abode was with her during the Forty Days . 214
No human being except herself could give direct testimony of the Incarnation 216
Passages cited, in objection, from the Gospels . . . 218
(1) "How is that ye sought Me?" Luke ii. 49 . . ib.
(2) "Woman what to Me and thee?" John ii. 4 . . 220
(3) His reply when His Mother and brethren were announced as seeking Him. Matt. xii. 46–50, &c.. 222
(4) The woman who exclaimed as to His Mother's blessedness. Luke xi. 27, 28. 224
Noteworthy particulars in Mary's visit to S. Elisabeth . . 226

ESSAY V.—THE SACRED HEART.

The Church's chief strength lies in love and loyalty to the Person of Jesus 228
Devotion to the Sacred Heart is one principal security for such love and loyalty 232

Recent outburst of devotion to the Sacred Heart . . *page* 235
Archbishop Manning and Dr. Nicholson 236
What adoration is due to the Sacred Humanity? . . . 239
And to the Sacred Heart? 242
Deification of the Sacred Humanity 243
Allegation considered, that uneducated Catholics often adore the Sacred Heart, without remembering that it is the Heart of God 245
The doctrine maintained by a writer in the "Guardian" . 246
Ninth Canon of the Fifth Council 249
Dr. Nicholson's statements 251
Rarity, among Anglicans, of orthodoxy on the Incarnation . 252

ESSAY VI.—S. PAUL'S RELATIONS WITH S. PETER.

Purpose of the Essay 257
Catholic doctrine in regard to the old Ceremonial Law . . 259
To the Apostles was committed the task, of gradually proclaiming this doctrine and carrying it into effect . . 263
The appointment of deacons 264
The conversion of Samaria 265
The conversion of Cornelius 266
The conversion of idolatrous Gentiles 269
All these successive steps took place, before S. Paul was an Apostle at all 271
There is no trace in S. Paul's history of his supposing, that he was superior in doctrinal knowledge to the other Apostles, or that he had any power of government independent of his union with them 272
His first act, on being driven from Damascus, was to visit S. Peter 273
His missionary work at Antioch was under commission from the then Apostles 275
His elevation by God to the Apostolate 276
Various forms then existent of Judaizing error . . . 277
Conflict of the extreme Judaizers with S. Paul at Antioch . 280

S. Paul went to Jerusalem to confer with the Three . *page* 282
Certain intimations of S. Peter's Primacy at this part of the narrative 283
Conference of the five Apostles and Jerusalem elders . . 284
An assemblage of the whole body of Jerusalem Christians . 285
Striking identity of S. Peter's doctrine with S. Paul's . . ib.
In these proceedings, both S. Paul and S. James occupied a subordinate place to S. Peter 286
S. Paul's own account of these facts is incapable of an anti-Catholic interpretation 289
S. Paul's resistance to S. Peter at Antioch 294
Argument considered, which is founded by Protestants on the general rhetoric and spirit of S. Paul's language, where he records his resistance to S. Peter 298
The Church has ever considered that S. Peter and S. Paul were united in closest harmony 303

ESSAY VII.—S. MARY MAGDALENE IN THE GOSPELS.

Is S. Mary Magdalene identical with Mary of Bethany and with the "peccatrix" of Luke vii. 37? 305
Relevant texts recited 307
The anointing of Luke vii. is plainly a distinct act from that of John xii. 308
S. John however virtually says, that Mary of Bethany is identical with the peccatrix 310
"The village of Mary and Martha" 313
Reply to a supposed objection 315
Further reasons for regarding Mary of Bethany as identical with the peccatrix. 316
The peccatrix seems pointed out in Scripture as identical with S. Mary Magdalene 317
Singular prominence, among the disciples, assigned in Scripture to S. Mary Magdalene 318
Singular faith, hope and love exhibited by the peccatrix . 320
The penitent thief 324

Reply to the objection, that S. Mary Magdalene had been *possessed* by devils, and that this is incompatible with her having freely yielded to their solicitation . . *page* 325
Reply to a most strange Protestant objection . . . 328
Mary of Bethany seems indicated in Scripture as identical with S. Mary Magdalene 330
Negative argument from Scripture for the identity of the three 332
The three display similarity of interior character . . . ib.
Suggested harmony of the Gospel narrative 336
Does the Church's authority bear on the question discussed in this Essay? 340
Advantage of every instance in which it is shown, that some characteristically Catholic doctrine harmonizes with Scripture criticism 342

Essay VIII.—F. Coleridge on the Gospels.

The Incarnation 343
A second mercy, distinct from the former, is, that the memory of God's human words and acts has so largely been preserved 345
It was to be expected that the record of these words and acts would contain serious difficulties 347
Such an exposition of the Gospels as F. Coleridge's is of singular value 348
He has studied in the school of Saints 349
His work must contain a large amount of theological teaching 353
He has appropriated modern advances in the science of criticism 354
He has studied the circumstances of Palestine as then existent 357
He places before his reader's imagination vivid pictures of successive events 358
Great superiority of Catholic over Protestant interpretation of Scripture 360

F. Coleridge's view on the order and harmony of Gospel events . . . . . *page* 361
Conviction engendered by such a work, that the facts recorded in the Gospels are true 365
The form in which this commentary is exhibited . . . 366
The connection between Scriptural and ascetical studies . 368
F. Coleridge's second volume 369
His third volume 375

Essay IX.—Gospel Narrative of the Resurrection.

Mr. Hutton on the Gospel narrative of the Resurrection . 378
Certainly S. Matthew seems on the surface to imply, that Jesus did not appear to the Apostles before they saw Him in Galilee 384
Certainly S. Luke seems on the surface to imply, that Jesus did not appear to the Apostles in Galilee at all . . 386
Characteristics of composition observable in the Gospels . 387
Both S. Matthew and S. Luke, when duly examined, show that they do not mean what primâ facie they seem to imply 388
Two different purposes intended by the manifestations of Jesus Risen 393
One purpose specially borne in mind by S. Matthew . . ib.
The other purpose specially borne in mind by S. Luke . . 398
S. John's narrative 400
S. Mark's narrative 405
The Gospel narrative of the Resurrection as a whole . . 408
Certain difficulties considered on the events of Easter Day . 412
The Gospel narrative, considered intrinsically, adds corroborative proof to the truth of the Resurrection . . . 418

ESSAY X.—F. COLERIDGE'S LIFE OF OUR LIFE.

F. Coleridge's special qualifications as an expositor of the Gospels . . . . . *page* 420
The effect of such a work in corroborating the truth of Gospel facts 422
Very strong motives which should stimulate all competent persons to a careful study of the Gospels . . . 423
F. Coleridge's singular qualifications for the office of Harmonist 431
On what principle should a Harmony treat the frequent case, of two narrations identical with each other in very many particulars but not in all? 432
The healing of two blind men near Jericho 436
Remarkable silences of the Evangelists 439
Was each Evangelist acquainted with the previous Gospels? 443
F. Coleridge draws a much greater distinction than is commonly done, between S. Luke and his predecessors . 445
What was the origin of the Four Gospels? 447
On what principle did the writers select the words and acts they should record? 451
F. Coleridge's remarks on the Hidden Life of Jesus . . 452
F. Coleridge's subdivision of the period of the Public Life . 457
His view on the Gospel narrative of the Resurrection . . 462
CONCLUSION 467

CATHOLIC DEVOTION TO OUR BLESSED LADY.

An Eirenicon. By Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D. Oxford : Parker.

A Letter Addressed to Dr. Pusey. By J. H. Newman, D.D. London : Burns & Oates.

The Leading Topics of Dr. Pusey's Work Reviewed. By the Very Rev. Canon Oakeley. London : Longmans.

[July 1866.]

HOWEVER the Eirenicon controversy may terminate in the case of Dr. Pusey himself—and we sincerely hope and pray it may issue in his conversion—it will have indubitably much promoted the advancement of English Catholicity. This it will have done in two different ways. For, firstly, the mind of Englishmen is ordinarily prejudiced against Catholic doctrine and practice by a vast amount of vague disgust, of which one cannot attempt the removal, because it assumes no definite shape whatever; whereas Dr. Pusey has given to this disgust a distinct and articulate expression, so that the Catholic can fairly encounter it. Then, secondly, Englishmen, with all their supposed love of fair play, are the most bigoted of men whenever the Church is in question; and under ordinary circumstances they simply refuse to see or to hear whatever is advanced in her favour: but the interest excited by the Eirenicon may possibly

just for the moment give Catholics a chance of being listened to.

We will take advantage then of this favourable juncture, in regard to the chief topic which the Eirenicon treats. Whether you look at Dr. Pusey himself, or at the great mass of religiously-minded Protestant Englishmen, the one prejudice, which more than all others put together exasperates them against the Church, is the worship of our Blessed Lady therein prevalent.* So far as this prejudice is founded on true zeal for her Son's honour, no Catholic can regard it otherwise than with heartfelt sympathy.

* We do not see why we should avoid this most serviceable word "worship," for which it is very difficult to find a substitute. Canon Oakeley most truly remarks : "A great part of the objection to the language of Catholic devotion arises from the practice of confining certain words to their conventional sense, instead of interpreting them according to the intention of the writer or speaker ; or, on the other hand. of restricting to a secondary and technical use those which are employed in a more general sense. Thus there is really no difference in fact between the terms 'worship' and 'veneration ;' yet, while mere human qualities are popularly considered to warrant veneration, Catholics are charged with idolatry who speak of the Blessed Virgin as an object of worship ; a charge the more impertinent when we remember that in the words of the marriage rite, common to Catholics with Protestants, this term is actually employed in the sense of 'service' or 'devotion.' The word 'adoration,' again, has come to be restricted, like that of 'prayer,' to the homage claimed by God only ; though the first, according to its etymology, need mean no more than 'invocation,' and the second, though refused to the Saints, is used without scruple in petitions to Parliament. All such words mean only what they are meant to imply. They are to be interpreted by our intention, and not our intention by them" (p. 74).

There is no Catholic but will be forward to admit, that if the worship of Mary tended in any way to interfere with the worship of Almighty God, it could not have His sanction; and, consequently, that a society which inculcates it could not be the Catholic Church. We agree with Dr. Pusey then, from the very bottom of our heart, on the matter of principle; but he and we are wide as the poles asunder on the matter of fact. We speak of devotions to Mary even as wearing that extreme shape in which he himself exhibits them, so far as he cites authorized and approved writers. Of these devotions it is little to say that they in no way *impede* the love of God and of Jesus Christ; we maintain confidently that they *promote* that love in a most singular and special degree. On many grounds we deplore, for his own sake, his dislike of these devotions; but on no ground more strongly than because, by not practising them, he loses so inestimable a help towards genuine love of God. This is the very reason why the thought of abandoning them is so intolerable to a Catholic, who is attracted towards them by the Holy Ghost. For the sake of peace, of charity, of unity, he might cheerfully waive any mere matter of personal taste or liking; but he cannot waive what is so indissolubly bound up with the great end for which he was created.

Two lines of objection, essentially different in kind, are urged by the Protestant world against these devotions: the one, historical and theological; the other, moral and spiritual. On the one hand, it is alleged that there is no evidence on which to rest

them in Scripture and Antiquity; on the other hand, that they obscure the thought of God and tend to idolatry. Dr. Pusey, like other pious Protestants, very rightly lays far greater stress on the latter than on the former allegation; and it will be our one purpose in this article seriously to consider it. The historical and theological difficulty we reserve for consideration in our next number. And to that future article we of course defer whatever it is necessary to say, on the doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and of the Assumption; because no one can think that these doctrines in themselves have any tendency to generate idolatry. It is on the vitally important question then just stated—the alleged effect of Catholic devotion to Mary as generating a quasi-idolatry and obscuring the thought of God—that we now proceed to enlarge.

I.

All devotion, let it be observed, presupposes doctrine. Thus the mere fact of Catholics praying at all to our Lady, implies the *doctrine* that she can hear their prayers. If I pray her that she will be close at hand whenever temptation assails me,—I imply the *doctrine* that she is well aware of the fact whenever one of her votaries is *assailed* by temptation. Again, if I beseech her to suggest those thoughts which may be most salutary under my present interior condition, I imply three different *doctrines:* viz., (1) that she has a real power (direct or indirect) of suggesting thoughts;

(2) that she knows my present interior condition; and (3) that she knows what thoughts are most salutary for me *in* that condition. Indeed every devout Catholic feels, that if such belief in our Lady's power did not exist as a foundation, the whole fabric of his devotion to her would collapse and fall. Our defence therefore of Catholic devotion must be itself in some sense a defence of Catholic doctrine.

Now the various doctrines, indiscriminately assailed by Dr. Pusey, belong to very different classes. The first and most important consists of those, which are magisterially, and therefore infallibly, taught by the Church. How does she thus magisterially teach them? By the fact that Pope and bishops throughout Christendom promote, encourage, nay inculcate, a devotion —and further that successive Pontiffs have most richly indulgenced it—which implies and presupposes the doctrines in question. In our last number we drew out a list of such doctrines; and as that list still seems to us sufficiently complete, we cannot do better than reprint the paragraph.

"In order to appreciate Dr. Pusey's various propositions, it is very important that we briefly and generally explain what are those doctrines concerning her which we maintain to be authoritatively, and therefore infallibly, taught by the Church. They are, we think, such as these:—(1.) That her merits are incomparably greater than those of any other created person.* (2.) That, accordingly, she occupies a place in heaven

* "Our God Himself loves thee [Mary] alone more *than all men and angels together.*"—(Raccolta, p. 185.)

incomparably nearer to her Son than any other. (3.) That she is intimately acquainted with the thoughts, the character, the circumstances, of all who invoke her aid; and well knows what is really for their greatest good. (4.) That she has incomparably greater power than any other created person, towards promoting that good. (5.) That to unite ourselves with Mary in the contemplation of Jesus,—as is done e.g. by those who duly recite the Rosary,—is a singularly efficacious means for vividly apprehending His Divine Personality and His various mysteries. (6.) That the intimate and most loving thought of her has an efficacy, peculiarly its own, in promoting a tender and practical love of Him. (7.) That regular and repeated prayer to her cannot be omitted by a Catholic, without putting his salvation into grievous peril.* Other propositions might be added to these; and the proof which we would allege, of such propositions being really contained in the Church's authoritative teaching, is this: —If any one of them were denied, the exhortations impressed on Catholics throughout Christendom, with full approbation of Pope and Bishops, would be baseless and indefensible; influential religious habits, whose growth is sedulously fostered by ecclesiastical authority, would be founded on a delusion; the Church would have in fact made a mistake, unspeakably serious, in that very matter—the training of souls for heaven—which is the one ultimate end for which she was endowed with infallibility."

In further illustration of the Church's teaching, we will insert, almost at random, various extracts from the "Raccolta," so admirably translated by F. St. John

* "O Mary. . . . *I shall assuredly be lost if I abandon thee.* . . . It is impossible for that man to perish who faithfully recommends himself to thee."—(Raccolta, p. 184.)

of the Birmingham Oratory. There cannot be more unimpeachable proofs of the Church's doctrine, than those various prayers which she authoritatively recommends to her children by indulgencing their use.

"When at length my hour is come, then do thou, Mary, *my hope*, be thyself my aid in those great troubles wherewith my soul will be encompassed. *Strengthen me*, that I may not despair when the enemy sets my sins before my face. Obtain for me at that moment grace *to invoke thee often*, so that I may breathe forth my spirit with *thine own sweet name and that of thy most holy Son upon my lips*" (p. 183).

"*In thee let the Holy Church find safe shelter;* protect it, and be its sweet asylum, its tower of strength, impregnable against every inroad of its enemies. Be thou *the road leading to Jesus;* be thou *the channel whereby we receive all graces needful for our salvation.* Be thou our help in need, our comfort in trouble, our strength in temptation, our refuge in persecution, our aid in all dangers; but especially in the last struggle of our life, at the moment of our death, when all hell shall be unchained against us to snatch away our souls,—in that dread moment, that hour so terrible, whereon our eternity depends, ah, yes, most tender Virgin, do thou then make us feel how great is the sweetness of thy Mother's Heart, and the power of thy might with the Heart of Jesus, by opening for us a safe refuge in the very Fount of mercy itself, that so one day we too may join with thee in Paradise in praising that same Heart of Jesus for ever and for ever" (p. 179).

"I would I had a greater love, a more tender love: this thou must gain for me, since *to love thee is a great mark of predestination*, and a grace which God grants to those who shall be saved" (p. 185).

"Thou, Mary, art *the stewardess of every grace which God vouchsafes to give us sinners,* and therefore did He make thee so mighty, rich, and kind, that thou mightest succour us. I will that I may be saved: *in thy hands I place wy eternal salvation,* to thee I consign my soul. I will be associated with those who are thy special servants; reject me not. *Thou goest up and down seeking the wretched to console them.* Cast not away then a wretched sinner, who has recourse to thee. Speak for me, Mary; thy Son grants what thou askest" (pp. 186-7).

"My Queen! my Mother! *I give thee all myself;* and to show my devotion to thee, *I consecrate to thee this day my eyes, ears, mouth, heart, myself wholly, and without reserve.* Wherefore, O loving Mother, as I am thine own, keep me, defend me, *as thy property, and thy own possession.*

"*Ejaculation in any Temptation.*

My Queen, my Mother! remember I am thine own. Keep me, defend me, as thy property, thy own possession" (p. 197).

"Accept what we offer, grant us what we ask, *pardon us what we fear;* for *thou art the sole hope of sinners.* Through thee we hope for the forgiveness of our faults; and in thee, most blessed one, is the hope of our reward. Holy Mary, succour the wretched, help the faint-hearted, comfort the sorrowful, pray for the people, shield the clergy, intercede for the devout female sex, let all feel thy help who celebrate thy holy commemoration. *Be thou at hand, ready to aid our prayers, when we pray;* and return to us *laden with the answers we desire.* Make it thy care, blessed one, to intercede ever for the people of God—thou who didst deserve to bear the Redeemer of the world, who liveth and reigneth for ever and ever" (p. 199).

"O Joseph, help us with thy prayers to be of the number of those who, *by the merits of Jesus and His Virgin Mother,* shall be partakers of the resurrection to glory" (pp. 274-5).

"O Joseph, obtain for us, that, *being entirely devoted to the service of Jesus and Mary,* we may live and die for them alone" (p. 275).

"O Joseph, obtain for us, that, having our hearts freed from idle fears, we may enjoy the peace of a tranquil conscience, *dwelling safely with Jesus and Mary, and dying at last in their arms*" (p. 275).

Let it be clearly understood then, that in this particular part of our article we are not occupied with defending the truly beautiful sentiments which Dr. Pusey has brought together, from S. Alphonsus; from S. Bernardine of Sienna; from the Ven. Grignon de Montfort. On *their* defence we shall enter afterwards; and shall face distinctly the whole mass of testimony, adduced in the Eirenicon from Catholic writers. Here however we speak of doctrines, not merely permitted and sanctioned by the Church, but authoritatively inculcated on all her children.

Now as to these doctrines, an opponent may reasonably require due evidence for their truth, antecedently to bringing against them any objection whatever; for a doctrine is not established, nor even made probable, by the mere circumstance that it is unobjectionable. Such evidence however we consider ourselves to have most abundantly supplied, in our two last numbers. We assumed merely that Christianity is of divine origin, and that the New Testament

narrative is substantially true. We argued in January that, if this be once granted, it follows that the Roman Catholic Church is indubitably infallible; and we argued in April that this infallibility includes prominently infallibility in her *practical magisterium*.* We submit that no conclusion, resting on historical grounds and claiming moral not mathematical certainty, was ever more firmly established, than the conclusion at which we arrived in those two articles. That conclusion is, that if Christianity is really of divine origin, and if the New Testament narrative is accurate as to its general substance, then the Roman Catholic Church is infallible in her practical magisterium. But Dr. Pusey will be the very last man to deny, that she does magisterially teach such doctrines as those above recited, and others of a similar character. Since therefore she magisterially teaches these doctrines,—and since she is *infallible* in her magisterium,—it follows that these doctrines are infallibly true.

However, their argumentative establishment does not exempt a controversialist from the obligation of answering objections. Even in the region of pure mathematics, a thesis would be left in a most unsatisfactory state although it had been proved by rigorous demonstration, if a plausible objection against its truth were to remain unanswered. And much more of course does this hold, in such a matter as is here before us. Now (as has been already observed) there are two kinds of objections, essentially different, which have been raised against the body of doctrine now in

* See Perrone "de Locis," nn. 347–8.

question. Those objections, which refer to its supposed inconsistency with Scripture and Antiquity, will be considered in our next number ;* those which rest on its alleged tendency to obscure the thought of God and to promote a quasi-idolatry, must be encountered here.

II.

We will begin with considering an argument, which is often used by Protestants and even by Tractarians, though Dr. Pusey does not himself endorse it. "By the very fact that Catholics believe our Lady to hear their prayer and to know their thoughts, they represent her," so runs the argument, "as omnipresent and as a kind of goddess." There is no more curious fact in all controversy, than that any Christian, who believes in the Incarnation, should have laid stress on a fallacy so easily and so triumphantly refuted. Consider that dear soul of our Blessed Lord, which was created for the very purpose of suffering in our behalf, and which did in fact experience anguish so unspeakable. When our Lord was enduring His agony, or was hanging on the cross, or now that He is in heaven,—does any Christian doubt that His soul did and does know the thoughts of those who address Him? that it did and does apprehend most accurately men's interior circumstances? that it did and does know what is the fittest and most appropriate remedy for their interior evils? Yet, do Christians therefore regard that soul as omnipresent? as uncreated? as infinite? How readily Protestants take up a weapon against the

* [See the Third Essay in this volume.]

Church, which recoils on themselves with effect the most fatal!

We will not however be contented with stating this parallel negatively; we will draw it out in a positive shape. How do Protestants explain this vast knowledge possessed by the soul of Christ? We are not aware of any explanation, except that given by Catholic theologians. That soul, say these theologians, was endued from the very beginning of its existence with three kinds of knowledge: the chief of them being "scientia beata;" that knowledge which arises from the facial vision of God. In Christ's case,—these theologians proceed,—this facial vision imparted, and imparts, the knowledge of all things past, present, and future; of the most hidden thoughts of the heart, no less than of the most visible and palpable phenomena of the universe. Such then is the account, we suppose, given by all those Protestants who give any at all, of Christ's human knowledge. But now consider. This facial vision of God was enjoyed by Mary from the moment of her death, quite as truly, though of course by no means in the same degree, as by Christ Himself. We are very far indeed from saying that the knowledge which she thus obtains is co-extensive with the human knowledge of Christ; to suppose so, would be a monstrous and intolerable error. But we do say that, even if it *had* been thus co-extensive, she would not on that account have ceased to be a creature: unless indeed you would sanction the heretical and even absurd proposition, that the soul of Christ was raised from the sphere of

createdness and finiteness to that of infinity and omnipresence.

We have been answering the objection, that to regard our Lady as knowing the thoughts of her suppliants, is logically and philosophically equivalent with regarding her as omnipresent. Some Protestants however candidly waive this objection, and admit that a Catholic does not speculatively view her as infinite: yet they urge at the same time that such is his *practical* impression; that the interior acts of reverence and homage, with which he approaches her, are undistinguishable in kind from those with which he approaches Almighty God. Dr. Pusey is as far from sympathizing with this view as with the former;* and, indeed, his line of objection directly contradicts it, as will be immediately seen. We will not then say more about it in this place, as it will be implicitly encountered by our subsequent remarks.

In no other part of the Eirenicon can we find so clear a statement of Dr. Pusey's own objection, as in the following; which, as will be seen, contains an admission, that Roman Catholics do not in fact pay her divine worship. We have substituted our own italics for his.

"This question of reliance upon the Blessed Virgin as *the* being in whose hands our salvation is virtually to be placed, is quite distinct from *that other question of the nature of the worship paid to her*. The one is a

* Some words of his indeed, in p. 184, seem at first sight to express this view; but if you take them in connection with the pages which precede and follow, you will see that their sense is different. These preceding pages will be immediately quoted at length in our text.

practical question affecting our whole eternity, 'What shall I do to be saved?' *The practical answer to the Roman Catholic seems to me to be, 'Go to Mary, and you will be saved;'* in our dear Lord's own words, it is, 'Come unto Me;' in our own belief it is, 'Go to Jesus, and you will be saved.'

"The answer which is commonly made, that devotion to the Blessed Virgin is but relative, does not touch this. *No one would impute to the Marian writers that they mean that she is Dea,* although notoriously, some of them have called her so.* But they speak of what comes to the same, of her 'delegated omnipotency;' and a recent writer says, 'When Mary, in her office of Advocate, is named "Omnipotency kneeling," or "interceding Omnipotency," this will now, I hope, appear to be saying not too much but too little.' *The human mind is narrow, and easily filled with one thought, especially when that thought relates to one's all.* When, then, the soul is taught that devotion to Mary is essential; that she is 'the nearest to us, and the most suited to our capacity;' that 'to go to Jesus, we must go to Mary; she is our Mediatrix of intercession;' that she repels none; 'she is good and tender; she has nothing in her austere and repulsive;' it *seems inconceivable that many should not stop short in her,* with, at best, a more or less indistinct reference to Jesus" (pp. 181-3).

In order that we may bring the argument between Dr. Pusey and ourselves to a more definite issue, we

* What "Marian" ever called her so? Dr. Pusey has adduced no authority whatever for his statement. Curiously enough, we believe that such a phrase, used figuratively of course, does occur in the "Christus Patiens," a poem of the *patristic* period. But what *later* Catholic writer has so spoken? We ask for information: we cannot, of course, assert confidently the negative, but we have never met with any such expression.

will disentangle this passage from all reference to individual writers; and we will express in our own words, to the best of our power, the argument intended by our author.

"Man's mind," we understand Dr. Pusey to say, "is narrow; his affections easily exhausted; his very "time limited. I do not here speak of saintly men; "and God forbid I should suggest that these men take "from the Son any portion of the love which they give "to the Mother.* But I speak of the mass as we find "them, of those who fulfil their religious duties in an "ordinary and quiet way. These men give a certain "portion of each day to prayer; and it is arithmetically "evident, that if some of that portion goes to Mary, "there will be so much the less left for their God and "Saviour. But this is far from the worst. It is quite "indefinitely pleasanter and easier to fallen man that "he shall address a fellow-creature, than that he "shall adore the Infinite Creator. If Catholics "then are told that she knows their thoughts and "can grant their petitions, they will be ever increasing "the time devoted to her at the expense of that "devoted to God. They will thus more and more "learn practically to look to *her* for pardon, for help, "for strength, for consolation. It is their prayer to "*her* which will issue freely and warmly from the "heart, while their addresses to God will be little "more than the perfunctory and external performance "of a certain stated and prescribed routine."

* Dr. Pusey expressly admitted this, in a letter to the "Weekly Register" of November 25, 1865.

Such representations as these—and they are common from the most "high-church" Protestants—tend to make a Catholic wring his hands in perplexity and distress. Oh, Dr. Pusey, if you could see for one moment into the heart of an ordinarily devout Catholic, you would see how absolutely imaginary, nay, how wild, is the picture you draw of him. But how can we persuade you of this? How are we to answer, in a way that shall carry conviction to your mind, those ingenious sophisms which you have so perversely constructed? It is like labouring to teach a blind man the true nature of colours.

Yet surely Dr. Pusey's mental attitude is indefensible. If a blind man grieves over his calamity, how sincerely we commiserate him! how earnestly we try to help him! But what if he will not admit himself to be in a position of disadvantage at all? What if he declares that all who profess the possession of eyesight are in a conspiracy to deceive him? What if he maintains that in fact there is no such thing as colour? And is not this the true parallel to Dr. Pusey? He has never experienced, or come near to experiencing, the state of mind engendered by a constant and loving devotion to Mary: and yet he confidently pits his à priori augury of what that state of mind must be, against the unanimous testimony of those who *know* that phenomenon on which he descants in ignorance.

Our wish however is not to convict Dr. Pusey, but to convince him; and we may possibly succeed in this, if we can but turn the tables on himself. We will suppose then (what is at least imaginable) a pious and

devout Theist, who labours under a blind prejudice against the doctrine of the Incarnation, not dissimilar to that which influences Dr. Pusey against the Church's doctrines concerning our Blessed Lady. He may be supposed to express himself in such terms as these:—

"Men were created for one end—the knowledge "and love of God. They better fulfil that end there- "fore,—they are more perfect of their kind,—in pro- "portion as they more constantly keep the thought "of God before them; contemplate His excellencies; "labour to fulfil His commands. Now this unhappy "doctrine of the Incarnation presents one constant "impediment in the way of man's great work. When "we Deists are oppressed with trial, temptation, suf- "fering, we stimulate our confidence in the Almighty "Creator, by steadily fixing our thoughts on His Infi- "nite Mercy and His Infinite Power. But you Trini- "tarians, I have repeatedly observed, shrink from this: "it is not once in a thousand times that your pious "affections take any such turn. No: You fix your "thoughts, not on the Infinite Love which is enter- "tained for you by God; but on the finite love which "(as you think) is entertained for you by that created "soul, which you believe God to have assumed: and "you ponder accordingly on the various most touch- "ing circumstances of Christ's Life and Passion. Yet "even if I were to grant your full doctrine, it would "still remain true that the love felt for you by the soul "which so suffered is but a finite love. And further, "since no one finite object is nearer than any other "to the Infinite, it is true, in the strictest and most

" literal sense, that the love felt for you by the Divine " Nature as far exceeds the love felt for you by the " soul of Christ, as it exceeds the love you feel for " each other.

" Then, we preserve untouched that most sacred " truth, which your own Scriptures so prominently " testify; that God Alone can know men's thoughts: " whereas you admit the soul of Christ into a participa- " tion of that incommunicable privilege, and thereby " invest a finite object with the very attributes of " Infinity. Or, again, suppose I would rouse myself to " repentance for sin: I reflect on God's Infinite " Sanctity; on the disloyal insult which I have offered " to that Sanctity; and on the foul contrast between " God, the great Exemplar, and myself. Now I will " not say that you Trinitarians never do this; but I will " confidently say that you far oftener do something " else. You dwell on the anguish which you consider " your sin to have inflicted on the loving Heart of your " Redeemer; or on the contrast between your sin and " Christ's spotless sanctity—i.e., the spotless sanctity " of a created soul; or on your ingratitude for the " torments endured by that soul in your behalf; and " then you gaze with compunction on the pierced " hands and feet. In fact, you carry this quasi-idola- " trous principle into every detail of the interior life. " You do not come, as I may say, face to face " with God; what you call the Sacred Humanity " stands up as a constant barrier between Him and " your soul. Nor must I fail to add, that your doc- " trine of the Atonement has fearfully encouraged

" sin, by representing pardon for the most frightful " offences as so certain and so easily obtained.

" I do not here speak," he may continue to say, in closer parody of Dr. Pusey's assault on Catholics, " I " do not here speak of saintly men, but of the great " mass as we find them; of those who fulfil their " religious duties in a quiet and ordinary way. These " men give a certain fixed portion of each day to " prayer; and it is arithmetically evident that if some " of that portion goes to the created soul of Christ, so " much less will be left for the Infinite God. But this " is far from the worst. It is quite indefinitely easier " and more pleasant to man as he is, that he shall con- " template a created object—especially one invested " with the singularly pathetic and imaginative interest " surrounding Christ's Life and Passion—than that " he shall contemplate the Divine Nature. If men " are told therefore, that Christ's human soul knows " their thoughts and can grant their petitions,—they " will be ever increasing the time devoted to that " soul, at the expense of the time devoted directly to " the Uncreated. They will thus learn practically more " and more to look to the created soul of Christ " for pardon, for help, for strength, for consolation; " it is their prayers to that soul which will issue freely " and warmly from the heart; while their direct " addresses to the Divine Nature will be little more " than the perfunctory and external performance of a " certain stated and prescribed routine.

" Nor can you justly argue, in reply to all this, that " you regard the soul of Christ as appertaining to a

"Divine Person, and that your prayers to that soul "are addressed to God the Son. I do not deny that "such is your *theory;* but the simple *fact* is this. "For once that your pious affections are directed to "the Eternal Father, they are directed a thousand "times to the Sacred Humanity. You must perforce "therefore admit one of two alternatives, and I care "not which. Either you love the Second Person "of your Trinity far better than you love the First; "or else you love the created soul far better than you "love the Divine Person. In either case your doc-"trines of the Trinity and Incarnation have intro-"duced a shocking and most perverse corruption into "your practical worship."

Under the pressure of such arguments, we think that Dr. Pusey in his turn would be disposed to wring his hands in perplexity. Great would be his distress at finding that men can argue with such perverse ingenuity, on grounds purely à priori, in favour of a proposition proved to be monstrously and extravagantly false by the daily experience of every Trinitarian. In fact he would have a practical perception, of the effect which is produced on the mind of Catholics, by his own criticism of their devotion to *Mary*. The mere expression of such distress, however, would do but little to convince his Deistic opponent; for we will not suppose that the Deist is fairer in dealing with Dr. Pusey, than is Dr. Pusey in dealing with the Roman Church. Dr. Pusey therefore would be obliged, if the Deist had some considerable influence, to bring out a train of argument in reply; and this

argument might perhaps take some such shape as the subjoined. We should add that we are ourselves in complete agreement with the whole reply which here follows:—

"Man undoubtedly, I grant you—it is the very "foundation of all true religion—was created for one "end, the knowledge and love of God; he is more "perfect in proportion as such knowledge and love "are greater—in proportion as he is more prompt to "recognise and obey the Divine Will. But I cannot "admit for a moment that he advances more quickly "in such promptitude by contemplating exclusively "the Divine Nature, than by contemplating the "Sacred Humanity. Facts indeed prove most "emphatically the reverse. Nor is it at all difficult "to explain these facts. When an ordinary French "or Italian Catholic* contemplates the acts of Christ, "he contemplates them, not simply as the acts of a "finite soul, but as human acts of the Infinite God. "This will be evident to any one brought into contact "with the Catholics of those countries, by the awe "and lowly reverence which they exhibit in ponder- "ing on the various mysteries of Christ. In like "manner—that I may notice your other objections— "our thought of the anguish which our sin inflicted

* We here violate dramatic appropriateness; for Dr. Pusey would assuredly say in preference, "an ordinary member of the Anglican Church." We cannot admit however, that members of the Anglican Church, other than extreme Tractarians, do in general practically hold and realize our Lord's Divine Personality. On this we speak later in our article.

" on His Heart causes us, not to forget, but on the " contrary far more vividly to remember, that abhor- " rence of sin which characterizes the Divine Nature. " Again, our firm belief that the most hidden secrets " of our mind are open to the human soul of Christ, " does but intensify our realization of the doctrine " that God's Uncreated Nature is strictly Omni- " scient.

" Further, consider the close connection which exists " between what are called respectively ' sensible ' and " ' solid ' piety. By the former I mean the assemblage " of those various *emotions*—awe, gratitude, hope, joy, " tender love—which are produced by thinking on the " Objects of faith ; by the latter phrase, ' solid piety,' " is meant a ready promptitude of *will* towards the " love and service of God. Now, of saintly men great " marvels are recorded, concerning the devotedness " of will and purpose maintained by them under " afflicting aridity ; but, as regards the great mass of " mankind, it is impossible to exaggerate the import- " ance of *sensible* piety, as fostering true devotion of " *the will* to God. In all human matters you would " admit this. Suppose I felt no sensible pain in " hearing my mother foully slandered, nor any sen- " sible pleasure in fulfilling her wishes : you would " take for granted that I am not the man to put forth " any wonderfully strong efforts of *will* and active " exertion, whether to please her or to vindicate her " good name. From the absence, I say, of strong " *emotion*, you would at once infer that vigorous acts " of the *will* are also absent. And, in like manner,

"surely the cases are most rare and exceptional, "in which there is a hearty zeal of *will* for God's "glory, and a hearty love of *will* for His adorable "Sanctity, without corresponding *emotions* of zeal "and of love. Emotions have no merit in themselves, "doubtless; but their value is simply inappreciable, "as ministers and promoters of that which *is* valuable "and meritorious. Sensible pleasure, when intense, "penetrates the intellect with an unspeakably vivid "apprehension of its object, and thus leads to the "highest and choicest acts of the will.*

"This being understood, you should at once admit

* This truth is beautifully stated in F. Faber's "Growth in Holiness." "[During periods of sensible devotion] all trains of thought which concern heavenly things display a copiousness and exuberance which they never had before. Meditations are fluent and abundant. The virtues no longer bring forth their actions in pain and travail, but with facility and abundance, and their offspring are rich, beautiful, and heroic. There are provinces of temptations always in discontented and smouldering rebellion. But [now] we have a power over them, which is new and which is growing. We have such a facility in difficulties as almost to change the character of the spiritual life; and a union of body and spirit, which is as great a revolution as agreement and peace in a divided household. All these blessings are the mutations of the Right Hand of the Most High. Even to beginners, God often vouchsafes to give them, not merely as sugarplums to children, as some writers have strangely said, but to do a real work in their souls, and enable them to hold their way through the supernatural difficulties proper to their state. But proficients should ardently desire them, for they fatten prayer; and the perfect can never do without them, as they can never cease augmenting their virtues and rendering the exercise of them pleasant" (pp. 428–9).

" the inappreciable advantage obtained for us by our " belief in the Incarnation. It is the very ground of " your adverse argument, that the thought of Christ's " Life and Passion, in their touching and unapproach- " able circumstances, is immeasurably more attractive " to the imagination and affections of ordinary men, " than is any contemplation of God's Infinite Nature. " Since, therefore, so immeasurably more of *sensible* " piety is engendered by the former than by the latter, " far more of *solid* piety will also be thus engendered. " Moreover, nothing can be more extravagantly con- " trary to facts, than to say that the habit of praying " to Christ renders men's addresses to the Infinite " God perfunctory and lifeless. The very opposite is " well known to all devout Trinitarians. After having " pondered on some mystery of our Lord's life or Pas- " sion, we find an altogether fresh and indefinitely " increased tenderness in our thought of the Invisible " God. It is hardly an exaggeration indeed to say " that, for all our tenderness in the latter, we are " exclusively indebted to the former. And lastly, in " proportion as our explicit prayers are more lively " and heartfelt, in that proportion we more fully con- " secrate our whole lives to God, by keeping His re- " membrance in our mind throughout the day. The " regular practice then of prayer to the soul of " Christ and to God Incarnate (for these two prayers " indeed are substantially the same) is the one cause " to which we are almost exclusively indebted, for " our habits (whatever they may be) of Divine " love.

"As to the argument by which you finally clinch "your reasoning, I totally deny your assumed pre- "miss; I totally deny that that Object which I most "love is necessarily that on which my pious affections "most readily and spontaneously rest. Human "nature, being weak and corrupt, shrinks from that "which requires great effort and exertion. Nothing "then is more easily explicable, than that at some "given moment my thoughts fix themselves with "immeasurably greater readiness and spontaneous- "ness on an object—such as the soul of Christ— "which is far more level to my capacities of appre- "hension: certain though I am that—so far as it *can* "be considered separately from Him Whose soul it "is—I love it appreciatively with an affection, not "merely less in degree, but quite lower in kind, than "that which I entertain towards the Infinite God.

"And is not all which I have said borne out by "an experience, which I may really call visible and "palpable? Is it not visibly and palpably the fact, "that a love of God has been called into existence "among Christian Saints, indefinitely higher than "that exhibited by the great servants of God under "the old dispensation? nay, and different (one may "really say) *in kind* from any shown in the Christian "period, whether by Unitarians or by other disbelievers "in the Incarnation?"

Such a reply may fail to convince Dr. Pusey's opponent; but he will himself admit its force, and that is all we desire. We say then, that the above argument may be paralleled, in every essential particular, for the

defence of devotion to our Blessed Lady; that the same line of thought, which vindicates against Deists the worship of Jesus, vindicates no less triumphantly against Anglicans the worship of Mary. To this critical part of our reasoning we now proceed. But, before considering those particular Catholics to whom Dr. Pusey's objections apply, it will be well briefly to touch on other classes, which have a real existence and must not be forgotten. These classes, of course, melt into each other gradually and imperceptibly, so far as individuals are concerned; or the same man may fall from one class into a lower, and afterwards rise again. Still, on the whole, these various classes stand each on its distinct ground.

Protestants assure us e.g., that Italian brigands, who never think for a moment of God and their eternal destiny, often retain the habit of invoking the Mother of God; nay, of praying her to assist them in their nefarious schemes. We never could see what on earth this fact has to do with the question. So far from the Church being responsible for these men, they have broken off all connection with her; and they know very well that every priest in Christendom considers their course of life simply detestable. All we have to say then is that, scoundrel for scoundrel—if brigands there must be—we would rather that a scoundrel retained habits of prayer to our Lady, than that there should be no link whatever between him and Christianity.

Another class consists of those whom the Ven. Grignon de Montfort calls "presumptuous devotees;"

and who differ from those just mentioned in this respect, that they are really anxious about their salvation, and flatter themselves that they shall obtain it. We cannot better depict and estimate these men than in Montfort's very words; the italics, however, being ours.

"Presumptuous devotees are sinners abandoned to their passions, or lovers of the world, who, under the fair name of Christians and clients of our Blessed Lady, conceal pride, avarice, impurity, drunkenness, anger, swearing, detraction, injustice, or some other sin. They sleep in peace in the midst of their bad habits, without doing any violence to themselves to correct their faults, *under the pretext that they are devout to the Blessed Virgin.* They promise themselves that God will pardon them; that they will not be allowed to die without confession; and that they will not be lost eternally; because they say the Rosary, because they fast on Saturdays, because they belong to the confraternity of the Holy Rosary, or wear the scapular, or are enrolled in other congregations, or wear the little habit or little chain of our Lady. They will not believe us when we tell them that their devotion is only an illusion of the devil, and a pernicious presumption likely to destroy their souls. They say that God is good and merciful; that He has not made us to condemn us everlastingly; that no man is without sin; that they shall not die without confession; that one good Peccavi at the hour of death is enough; that they are devout to our Lady; that they wear the scapular; and that they say daily, without reproach or vanity, seven Paters and Aves in her honour; and that they sometimes say the rosary and the office of our Lady, besides fasting and other things. To give authority to all this, and to blind themselves still

further, they quote certain stories, which they have heard or read—it does not matter to them whether they be true or false,—relating how people have died in mortal sin without confession; and then, because in their lifetime they sometimes said some prayers, or went through some practices of devotion to our Lady, how they have been raised to life again, in order to go to confession, or their soul been miraculously retained in their bodies till confession; or how they have obtained from God at the moment of death contrition and pardon of their sins, and so have been saved; and that they themselves expect similar favours. *Nothing in Christianity is more detestable than this diabolical presumption.* For how can we say truly that we love and honour our Blessed Lady, when by our sins we are pitilessly piercing, wounding, crucifying, and outraging Jesus Christ her Son? If Mary laid down a law to herself to save by her mercy this sort of people, she would be authorizing crime, and assisting to crucify and outrage her Son. Who would dare to think such a thought as that?

"I say, that thus to abuse devotion to our Lady, which, after devotion to our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament is the holiest and solidest of all devotions, *is to be guilty of a horrible sacrilege*, which, after the sacrilege of an unworthy communion, is *the greatest and the least pardonable of all sacrileges*" (F. Faber's translation, pp. 66-8).

The superstition here condemned is truly deplorable and detestable. How widely it may extend, we have no means of certainly knowing; but Canon Oakeley, in his recent admirable pamphlet, tells us that he has never met with a single case of it:—

"It may be taken as an undoubted fact, that devotion to the Blessed Virgin is never an insulated

manifestation of Catholic piety. Where Catholics are not devout to our Lord, they are not devout to His Mother, and vice versâ; but I have never happened to meet with an instance of extraordinary devotion to the Blessed Virgin, without a corresponding expansion of piety in other directions. I know it is commonly said, that the merciful attributes of the Blessed Virgin are made by uninstructed Catholics an excuse for the commission of sin. I will not go so far as to plead my own limited experience against an equally authentic testimony in favour of such an abuse; nor indeed, were it clearly shown to exist, would it prove anything more than a new illustration of the poet's words, that 'Noblest things find vilest using.' Yet I will say, upon the word of a priest and confessor of nearly seventeen years' standing, that I have never met with a case of the kind. I have always found on the contrary, that one of the first symptoms of spiritual decline is the decay of devotion to the Blessed Virgin; and that they who realize enough of her office to know that she is our true Mother of Mercy cannot, if they would, divest themselves of the salutary impression, that she is also the purest of God's creatures, and that, as such, she is abhorrent of sin in all its forms" (pp. 29–30).

"Of course," he adds, "there is always a danger that sinners will be tempted to lay too great a stress on the merciful aspects of religion;" but this arises, not from any peculiar characteristic of devotion to the Mother of God, but from the corruption and sluggishness of human nature. Indeed, if on account of such abuses we may condemn this devotion, a similar condemnation must fall very far more heavily on two doctrines still more primary and fundamental: viz. the Atone-

ment of Christ and Justification by faith. For no perversion of her teaching concerning Mary can even be alleged to exist within the Roman Catholic Church, which will bear even a moment's comparison with the disgusting and appalling assemblage of blasphemy, that has been built by Antinomians on those two vital truths of the Gospel.

A third class consists of men, who are plunged indeed in mortal sin, and who will not bring themselves to go through that amount of prayer and effort which would lead without delay to their justification: yet who sincerely wish they led a better life; who feel keenly the peril and the misery of their state; while they cherish however the hope, that their Heavenly Mother will obtain for them such more powerful grace, as may carry them with far greater ease to genuine repentance. These men instinctively shrink from the explicit thought of God and of Christ, through their consciousness of sin and their fear of judgment to come; but this fear does not keep them back from her, to whom (as Catholics love to express it) Christ has committed the kingdom of mercy, while reserving to Himself that of justice. Now as to such sinners, every Catholic of course holds, (1) that if they die in their present condition they will be inevitably lost; (2) that the very fact of their remaining unreconciled to God involves the greatest danger, lest they fall frequently into fresh mortal sins; and (3) that the very delay of repentance becomes a mortal sin under certain circumstances, as e.g. when the Church's precept urges of confession and communion. But

such comments are beside the point. The question is simply this: other things remaining the same, is it or is it not beneficial, that they shall be frequent in prayer to the Blessed Virgin? Now, most evidently it *is* inestimably beneficial. If they practised no prayer to her, they would not be one whit more frequent in prayer to God; but on the contrary would give themselves up without reserve to the world and the devil. Nor have we any doubt whatever, that in numberless cases Mary draws such men, by her intercession with God, to true and efficacious attrition; and that thus multitudes are saved, who, but for their invocation of her sweet name, would have miserably perished.

We now come to that particular class which Dr. Pusey's argument concerns: the class of men who are free from mortal sin, and firmly resolved by God's grace not to commit it: but who are not as yet what is commonly called "interior;" who are not as yet labouring systematically to discover and correct their venial sins and imperfections, and to raise their thoughts and affections from earth to heaven. Of such men we maintain, that a solid and earnest devotion to our Lady is the most hopeful means they can adopt, for being raised by God into a higher state of mind. We must beg our readers to look back at pp. 13, 14, and refresh their memory as to Dr. Pusey's general ground of objection; because it is in answering such objection, that the reason for our own positive doctrine will most clearly appear. Our reply, it will be observed, preserves throughout a close parallel

with that, by which we suppose Dr. Pusey himself to have refuted those Unitarians and Deists, who may have been scandalized at his "idolatrous" worship of the Sacred Humanity. Nor can we better introduce what we would say, than by quoting (with our own italics) F. Newman's most eloquent and touching passage, on the respective characteristics of Jesus and Mary as Objects of worship.*

"It was the creation of a new idea and a new sympathy, a new faith and worship, when the holy Apostles announced that God had become incarnate; and a supreme love and devotion to Him became possible, which seemed hopeless before that revelation. But besides this, a second range of thoughts was opened on mankind, unknown before, and unlike any other, *as soon as it was understood that that Incarnate God had a Mother.* The second idea is perfectly distinct from the former, the one does not interfere with the other. *He is God made low, she is a woman made high*" (pp. 431–2).

"He who charges us with making Mary a divinity, *is thereby denying the divinity of Jesus.* Such a man does not know what divinity is. *Our Lord cannot pray for us, as a creature, as Mary prays: He cannot inspire those feelings which a creature inspires.* To her belongs, as being a creature, a natural claim on our sympathy and familiarity, in that she is nothing else than our fellow. She is our pride,—in the poet's words, 'Our tainted nature's solitary boast.' *We look to her without any fear, any remorse.* . . . . Our heart yearns towards that pure Virgin, that gentle Mother, and our congratulations follow her, as she

* [I am citing Cardinal Newman's letter to Dr. Pusey; and my references are to the pages of that letter, as they appear in the Cardinal's volume on "Difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic teaching."]

rises from Nazareth and Ephesus, through the choirs of angels, to her throne on high. So weak, yet so strong; so delicate, yet so glory-laden; so modest, yet so mighty. She has sketched for us her own portrait in the Magnificat. 'He hath regarded the low estate of His handmaid; for behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. He hath put down the mighty from their seat; and hath exalted the humble. He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich He hath sent empty away'" (pp. 433, 4).

Now we will first admit, for argument's sake, Dr. Pusey's most strange supposition, that devotion to our Lady does not ordinarily cause increase of the time given to prayer. We most cordially admit also of course his implied principle, that men are more excellent, more perfect of their kind, precisely in proportion as they grow in the knowledge and love of God. This indeed is the very "foundation" of S. Ignatius; and most assuredly is very far more consistently and loudly proclaimed within the Church than in any other religious society. But we maintain firstly, that this knowledge and love may be at certain times far more effectively promoted by prayer to Mary, than by direct prayer to God and Christ. Let us fix our ideas by an instance. A Catholic comes into a church in the middle of the day, from the dust and heat of his secular avocations. It will very often happen that, after he has genuflected before the Blessed Sacrament, his very best course for raising his heart to a fervent love of God will be prayer before an image of our Lady.

For consider. It is Dr. Pusey's own admission—nay, it is the very foundation of his whole argument—

that, with ordinarily pious men, it often requires far less effort and exertion to fix their thoughts on a created person, such as Mary, than on God Incarnate; and on such occasions therefore, their prayer to her will be far more earnest, far less distracted, far more heartfelt, than it would have been if addressed directly to God. Now, there are two different effects to be considered in the case of prayer. On the one hand, the various graces given by God of His own good pleasure in response to it; and, on the other hand, the result it produces, in the way (as it were) of natural cause and effect,* on the will and on the emotions. As to the former of these effects, there is no pretence for saying that prayer to Mary is less efficacious than direct prayer to Jesus; for it is ultimately addressed to Him, and that through the most acceptable of all mediators. As to the latter effect,—its quasi-natural result on the intellect, the will, the emotions—let this be borne in mind. It is a vitally important psychological fact, and one on which theologians lay the most earnest stress, that no man can desire evil for its own sake; that all men's thoughts and affections would be directed to God in one unintermittent stream, were it not for the innumerable corrupt interests and associations which enchain them by the cords of *pleasure*. In proportion then as at any moment I am disentangled from these meshes, in that very proportion I am more disposed to obey God's Will and to follow His Preference. Now remember

* For supernatural phenomena, no less than natural, have fixed mutual relations of their own.

that every Catholic regards Mary as absolutely free from the slightest approach to moral imperfection of any imaginable kind; and that her contemplation therefore is among the most powerful correctives of every inordinate and irregular passion. But, in proportion as every inordinate and irregular passion is corrected, in that very proportion the love of God is fostered and promoted; and the love of God therefore, instead of being impeded, is promoted with singular efficacy by prayer to the Most Holy Virgin. Since then such prayer, under the circumstances supposed, was very far more earnest and heartfelt than any other prayer would have been;—it was, under those particular circumstances, far more conducive than any other to increased love of God. Under favourable conditions indeed, it may so engender actual and vivid emotions of love and gratitude to God, that I can be no longer content without explicit worship of Him; that I prostrate myself before the Blessed Sacrament, and address Him (as it were) face to face; that in some sense I leave Mary for Jesus, and by so leaving her fulfil her highest wishes in my regard. As Montfort puts it, I have begun according to the Church's order with "benedicta tu in mulieribus;" and have been raised to the still higher step, "Benedictus Fructus ventris tui Jesus."

And here we are reminded, before we go further, of dwelling on a somewhat important consideration suggested by the above argument. What is meant when one says that each different saint has a *character* of his own? S. Paul, e.g., had his own very pronounced character; S. Peter his; and so of the rest.

It must mean at all events, that certain qualities very perceptibly and prominently predominate over the rest. Now does not this further imply that there is a certain want of complete harmony? a certain imperfection of temperament? On the other hand, our Saviour, as exhibited in the Gospels, has no "character;" no one quality predominates unduly over any other; He is the very image of the Infinitely Perfect God. And here we see under one aspect how broad is the contrast between devotion to Mary and to another Saint. She has no special "character" of her own, any more than her Son has; she is the "Speculum Justitiæ;" the faultless mirror of complete and harmonious sanctity.

We return to our argument. There cannot possibly be a greater mistake than to suppose, as Dr. Pusey does, that, with such Catholics as we are now considering, the worship of Mary reduces the worship of God and of Jesus to a perfunctory, external, uninteresting work. The very opposite holds most emphatically and prominently. We have already given one explanation of this; here is another. Devotion to our Lady, if constant and unremitting, will assuredly issue in a loving contemplation of her history; of those mysteries (as Catholics call them) joyful, sorrowful, glorious, which are commemorated in the Rosary. Now it has been frequently pointed out by Catholic controversialists—and it should be pondered on again and again—that there is no history of her current in the Church, except in closest connection with her Son. On the details of her life during those periods when her life was led apart

from His—before the Annunciation and after the Ascension—Scripture preserves a deep silence; nor has there been any beyond the most sparing supplement of Scripture from the stores of tradition. Her joys, as contemplated by Catholics, were in His Presence; her dolours in His Passion; her exaltation in His Resurrection and Ascension. To dwell on her mysteries, is to think of Him in the most affecting and impressive way in which that thought can possibly be presented.

Then again, in proportion as I grow in love and devotion to her, I am more prompt, of course, to do her bidding and fulfil her wishes. What is that bidding? what are those wishes? except that I obey her Son;—that I render to God that adoration which the Church prescribes. My love for her will make me earnestly desirous of doing this in the way she would have me do it; or, in other words, as a heartfelt and pious exercise.

Here then it will be in place to point out, how large a portion of their worship is offered directly to God, by those who follow the Church's rule, and who really seek therefore to please their Heavenly Mother. Cardinal Wiseman treated this excellently during the controversy of 1841–5.

"Now, to examine this view of the case, let us take as an instance, an Italian peasant. What are the religious exercises which are enjoined him, and which he regularly attends? First, the holy sacrifice of the Mass, every Sunday and holiday, and pretty generally every morning before going to work.

He knows, as well as you or I, what the Mass is, and that it cannot be offered up to any, save to God. Secondly, the Holy Communion at least several times a year; often, much more frequently. Thirdly, as a preparation for it, confession of his sins, penitently and contritely. These two sacraments he well knows have nothing to do [intrinsically] with the Blessed Mother of God. . . . . Fourthly, the Benediction, or adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, generally in the evening of all festivals, and often on other days. To this we may add the forty hours' prayer, or exposition of the Blessed Sacrament for that space of time, watched by adorers day and night. Among the prayers most frequently inculcated, and publicly recited, are acts of faith, hope, charity, and contrition, and well known by the most illiterate. These leading exercises of worship and devotion all belong to God: the principal one that is referable to the Blessed Virgin is the Rosary. This generally forms a part of family evening devotions, and is moreover occasionally said in public. I would gladly enter, did my present object permit such details, into an explanation and analysis of this devotion, one of the most beautiful to my mind: at present I need only say, that every book of devotion will show you, what the catechism in Italy, and I believe in Spain, fully explains, that the mysteries of our Saviour's Birth, Death, and Triumph, are the real objects of this form of prayer. However, take it as you please; consider it as a devotion principally addressed to the Blessed Virgin, and add to it any others usually said, as her Litany;—and I ask you what do they amount to, compared with the exercises of piety which I have before enumerated, the most solemn by far and the most indispensable? For every Catholic, however ignorant, knows that he must every festival assist at Mass, under pain of sin; but none imagine that a

similar penalty is attached to the neglect of any of their devotions to the Blessed Virgin. This surely forms a most important distinction between the two worships, that to God and that to the greatest of the Saints" ("Letter to Rev. J. H. Newman," pp. 22–4).

A similar view is powerfully expressed by F. Newman himself, in reply to Dr. Pusey.

"When strangers are so unfavourably impressed with us, because they see images of our Lady in our churches, and crowds flocking about her, they forget that there is a Presence within the sacred walls, infinitely more awful, which claims and obtains from us a worship transcendently different from any devotion we pay to her. That devotion might indeed tend to idolatry, if it were encouraged in Protestant churches, where there is nothing higher than it to attract the worshipper; but all the images that a Catholic church ever contained, all the crucifixes at its altars brought together, do not so affect its frequenters, as the lamp which betokens the presence or absence there of the Blessed Sacrament. Is not this so certain, so notorious, that on some occasions it has been even brought as a charge against us, that we are irreverent in church, when what seemed to the objector to be irreverence was but the necessary change of feeling, which came over those who were there, on their knowing that their Lord was away?

"The Mass again conveys to us the same lesson of the sovereignty of the Incarnate Son. . . . Hostile visitors enter our churches on Sunday at midday, the time of the Anglican service. They are surprised to see the high mass perhaps poorly attended, and a body of worshippers leaving the music and the mixed multitude who may be lazily fulfilling their obligation, for the silent or the informal devotions which are

offered at an image of the Blessed Virgin. They may be tempted, with one of your informants, to call such a temple, not a 'Jesus Church,' but a 'Mary Church.' But, if they understood our ways, they would know that we begin the day with our Lord and then go on to His Mother. It is early in the morning that religious persons go to mass and communion. The high mass, on the other hand, is the festive celebration of the day, not the special devotional service; nor is there any reason why those who have been at a low mass already should not at that hour proceed to ask the intercession of the Blessed Virgin for themselves and all that is dear to them.

"Communion, again, which is given in the morning, is a solemn unequivocal act of faith in the Incarnate God, if any can be such. . . . I knew a lady, who on her death-bed was visited by an excellent Protestant friend. She, with great tenderness for her soul's welfare, asked her whether her prayers to the Blessed Virgin did not, at that awful hour, lead to forgetfulness of her Saviour. 'Forget Him?' she replied with surprise, 'why, He has just been here.' She had been receiving Him in communion" (pp. 441–3).

All this, as we have said, would proceed equally on the most strange supposition, that worship of Mary is (as it were) so much arithmetically subtracted from direct worship of God; whereas we really believe that those most given to the former abound even more than others in the latter, from the increased attractiveness and joy which prayer presents to them. Mankind, as F. Newman once said, "are feeble-minded, excitable, effeminate, wayward, irritable, changeable, miserable." Pre-eminently they are *moody;* and a religion which shall persuasively influence them, must

be one effectually addressing itself to each successive mood. At one moment they will be readily disposed to direct and immediate worship of the Creator; at another they will give themselves with far more alacrity to that direct worship of Mary, which (let it never be forgotten) is always most truly, though indirectly, the worship of God. Nor can anything (to our mind) be more mistaken, than a carefully methodical calculation as to how much time is given to one and how much to the other.* On the contrary, the

* "The *scrupulous* devotees are those who fear to dishonour the Son by honouring the Mother, to abase the one in elevating the other. They cannot bear that we should attribute to our Lady the most just praises which the holy fathers have given her. *It is all they can do to endure that there should be more people before the altar of the Blessed Virgin than before the Blessed Sacrament: as if the one was contrary to the other, as if those who prayed to our Blessed Lady did not pray to Jesus Christ by her.* They are unwilling that we should speak so often of our Lady, and address ourselves to her. These are the favourite sentences constantly in their mouths: 'To what end are so many chaplets, so many confraternities, and so many external devotions to the Blessed Virgin? There is much ignorance in all this. It makes a mummery of our religion. Speak to us of those who are devout to Jesus Christ' (*yet they often name Him without uncovering:* I say this by way of parenthesis). 'We must have recourse to Jesus Christ; He is our only Mediator. We must preach Jesus Christ; this is the solid devotion.' What they say is true in a certain sense; but it is very dangerous, when, by the application they make of it, they hinder devotion to our Blessed Lady, and it is, under the pretext of a greater good, a subtle snare of the evil one. For never do we honour Jesus Christ more than when we are most honouring His Blessed Mother. Indeed we only honour Mary that we may the more perfectly honour Jesus, inasmuch as we only go to her as to the way in which we are to find the end we are seeking, which is Jesus."—(Montfort, pp. 63-4.)

very characteristic of Catholic devotion is its *spontaneousness*. Those who once were Anglicans and are now Catholics find in no respect, we believe, a wider contrast between their present life and their past, than in this element of spontaneousness. To pace along an old-fashioned Dutch garden, divided into prim walks and parterres, and with every step marked out for you, is no doubt (so far as it goes) a healthful exercise; but it gives no invigoration to the frame and spirits, which can be compared with that accruing from the liberty to roam at will over beautiful grounds, and gaze on enchanting scenery, and cull, according to your inclination of the moment, from a variety of exquisite flowers. Could Dr. Pusey have one day's *experience* of the true religion, he would shudder at the very thought of returning to the dreary routine of his Anglican exercises.

Yet surely at last there is no need of *reasoning* at all against Dr. Pusey's allegation; seeing it is a matter of visible and palpable experience, that (if we may so parallel S. Paul's words) where worship of Mary has abounded, there has worship of the Sacred Humanity abounded much more. It is the Roman Catholic Church which is the natural home,—as on the one hand of devotion to the Mother of God,—so on the other hand of those countless devotions—to the Passion, the Blessed Sacrament, the Sacred Heart, the Divine Infancy,—which are ever springing up in such luxuriance. On the other hand, every attempt at introducing such things in Dr. Pusey's communion is accepted by the common sense of Englishmen as an

infallible indication of "Popish" proclivities. We can understand Catholic churches being called "Mary Churches" by some ignorant extern, who knows nothing about the Blessed Sacrament, and who sees a large image of our Lady surrounded by eager suppliants, to their inestimable spiritual advantage. But by what possible indication he could be led to call an Anglican edifice a "Jesus Church," it utterly bewilders us to conjecture.* Is it in an *Anglican* edifice then, that he would see a colossal image of Christ Crucified, and a Crucifix placed conspicuously over each one of the numerous altars? For any visible emblems exhibited, one might as well give the appellation "Jesus Church" to a Mohammedan mosque.

Dr. Pusey may reply to all this, that still those Catholics of whom we speak have more *sensible feeling* towards the Mother than towards the Son. If the fact were really so, it would present to us no kind of difficulty; as we shall immediately say: but Cardinal Wiseman, than whom no Englishman has been better acquainted with foreign Catholics,† expresses a different opinion. These are his words; and the whole passage illustrates much of what we have been saying:—

* "In southern India and Ceylon our [the Anglican] churches are called by the natives 'Jesus Churches;' the Roman Catholic Churches 'Mary Churches.'"—(Eirenicon, p. 107.)

† We speak of "foreign Catholics;" because, as Dr. Pusey with much truth remarks, in England there is a "check from the contact with Protestants" (p. 120), which (to the serious detriment of Catholic Englishmen) keeps back tendencies from their legitimate issue.

"But again, I shall be told, that the manner in which the poorer Catholics pray before her images and those of the Saints, betrays a greater fervour of devotion than they display at other times; nay, that it even indicates a superstitious trust in those outward symbols themselves. This appearance may be partly true; though I am ready most completely to deny, that *half the ardour, enthusiasm, and devotion* is ever exhibited before relics or images, which you may see any day *before the Blessed Sacrament, when it is exposed to adoration.* But at the same time, I will assert that the tenderer emotions are not the proper tests of higher feelings, such as confidence, veneration, and homage. A child may be more fondling and affectionate with his mother, while he will more reverence, more obey, more believe, and more confide in his father. And so I conceive, that the more sensible part of devotion, that which works upon natural feelings, may be more apparently excited by the joys, the sufferings, the glories, and the virtues of beings more akin to our nature, than by contemplation of those, however much more perfect, of a Being infinitely removed from our sphere. What thought so powerful as to be able to measure the abyss of suffering which overwhelms the heart of Jesus, expiring on the cross? But what mind so dull, or what heart so callous, as not to be able to apprehend the maternal feelings of her who stands bereaved at its foot? Does not *her* grief, in fact, present us the truest and clearest mirror of *His* sufferings? Does not the 'Stabat Mater,' on that very account, excite the purest sentiments of love and sorrow for the Son, because His griefs are viewed through the sympathies of the Mother" ("Letter to Rev. J. H. Newman," pp. 24-25).

Sensible devotion in prayer is a phenomenon, which must always depend in great degree on accidental

circumstances of time, place, health, spirits, and the like. But as regards such Catholics as we are now considering, if any general statement can truly be made, it will (we think) be such as this. Sensible devotion to the Mother of God is a good deal more readily and immediately excited than to her Son; but, on the other hand, when the latter does come into existence, it is a good deal keener and more vivid. The thanksgiving, e.g., after a devout communion, will ordinarily be accompanied with feelings of far more exuberant exultation, than are any prayers to the Blessed Virgin.

However so let it be, if Dr. Pusey will, that these Catholics have more sensible devotion to Mary than to Jesus. What inference will he thence deduce? That love of Mary is to be discouraged? Take a parallel case. It will not be doubted that an ordinary Anglican has very much more tenderness of feeling towards a loved and loving mother, than towards Almighty God; that he will feel far more keenly an insult offered to her, than one equally serious offered to her Creator; that he will feel far more lively grief at having given her pain, than at having wounded his Saviour's Heart; that her company is a far more simple delight to him, than is the companionship with God in prayer. Moreover, there are some most serious texts, which might easily be so interpreted as to cause such a man serious alarm. "He who loveth father or mother more than Me, is not worthy of Me." "If any man cometh to Me and hateth not his father and mother, he cannot be My disciple." Yet Dr. Pusey would himself admit that, on the whole,

this human affection is most salutary; and that it is an invaluable safeguard against much evil. He would much wish that such a man loved God more; but most certainly he would not regard it as a step towards so desirable an end, that the earthly object were loved less tenderly. Why is it that Dr. Pusey so persistently disparages tenderness to the highest and purest of all creatures, while so tolerant of creature-love in a very far more questionable shape? Really, to read his language about Catholics, one would suppose that the great body of Anglicans exhaust the whole tenderness of their heart on Objects simply divine; that there is among them no love of mother, of wife, of children, of friends; that their heart beats with sensible love for God, and for God Alone.

In one word, then. Those Christians, of whom we are now speaking, are in general very far more easily diverted from worldly to heavenly thoughts, and very far more rapidly raised into sensible devotion, by the contemplation of Mary than in any other way. But sensible devotion (see pp. 22, 23) is of inappreciable value in promoting solid piety; and the contemplation of Mary, by its own nature, carries men forward out of itself into contemplation of Jesus and of God. Mary therefore is the way to Jesus, just as Jesus is the Way to the Father.

There is also another unspeakable advantage flowing from the worship of Mary, totally different from any of which we have yet spoken, and on which we shall have to enlarge in our next number.* Here we will but most

* [See the Third Essay in this volume.]

briefly touch on it. Catholic controversialists often and (we are convinced) most justly allege, that the vast majority of Protestants possess no real practical belief and realization of our Lord's Divine Personality. How are Catholics themselves preserved from this calamity? One most special safeguard is devotion to our Lady. The habit of approaching Him through a mediatrix places Him (if we may so speak) before their mind in the *position* of the Supreme Being. The appeal to His Mother's intercession "engraves upon the imagination of the faithful" (F. Newman's phrase) His Own Divine Personality. S. Bernardine and S. Alphonsus have borne fully as important a part as S. Athanasius and S. Cyril, in "imprinting" this doctrine "on the worship and practice of the Catholic people."

That passage from the Eirenicon which we quoted at starting, is immediately succeeded by the following:—

"It is difficult to see how direct heresy should not be suggested by sentences such as these (and they are so common): 'If we fear to go directly to Jesus Christ our God, whether because of His Infinite Greatness, or because of our vileness, or because of our sins, let us boldly implore the aid of Mary our Mother. *She* [Dr. Pusey's italics] is so charitable that she repels none of those who ask for her intercession, no matter how great sinners they have been; for, as the Saints say, never has it been heard, since the world was the world, that any one has confidently and perseveringly had recourse to our Blessed Lady and yet has been repelled.' For, for this argument to have any force, it must be implied to be possible that any could 'confidently and perseveringly have recourse to our

Divine Lord and yet be repelled,' which is, of course, directly against the Gospel" (pp. 183–4).

Now suppose an Anglican were to speak as follows:—"If we fear to go directly to the Invisible "God, whether because of His Infinite Greatness, or "because of our vileness, or because of our sins, let "us boldly appeal to that soul which so tenderly loved "us; which suffered for us anguish unspeakable; "whose greatest grief of all was, that so few would "avail themselves of His Redemption. That soul so "loves us that it repels none, no matter how great "sinners they may have been; for never has it been "heard, since the world was the world, that any one "who confidently and perseveringly prayed to Jesus "has been repelled." Beyond all possibility of doubt,—if it were true that the Catholic exhortation quoted by Dr. Pusey involves heresy,—it would be no less true that this Anglican exhortation involves heresy far fouler. It is very intolerable, we admit, to say that the love felt for us by Mary exceeds that felt for us by the soul of Christ; but it is immeasurably more horrible and monstrous to say, that the finite love felt for us by this latter exceeds the Infinite Love of the Eternal God. Dr. Pusey however would not misunderstand his co-religionist, as he misunderstands the Catholic Church. He would at once apprehend his meaning to be, not that the love felt for us by Christ's soul exceeds that felt for us by the Divine Nature; but, that when men are bowed down by a sense of sin, it is very far more easy for them to *realize* the former than the latter. Precisely similar is Montfort's mean-

ing in the passage cited by Dr. Pusey. Moreover it is important to remark that Dr. Pusey—without in any way indicating the omission—has dropped two sentences from the centre of that passage; which sentences fix it unmistakably to the sense we have just given. We put these two sentences into italics:—

"If we fear to go directly to Jesus Christ our God, whether because of His infinite greatness, or because of our vileness, or because of our sins, let us boldly implore the aid and intercession of Mary our Mother. *She is good, she is tender, she has nothing in her austere or repulsive, nothing too sublime and too brilliant. In seeing her, we see our pure nature. She is not the sun, who, by the vivacity of his rays, blinds us because of our weakness; but she is fair and gentle as the moon, which receives the light of the sun, and tempers it to render it more suitable to our capacity.* She is so charitable that she repels none of those who ask her intercession, no matter how great sinners they have been; for, as the saints say, never has it been heard since the world was the world, that any one has confidently and perseveringly had recourse to our Blessed Lady, and yet has been repelled" (pp. 57–58).

The contrast drawn by the saintly writer is not, you see, between Jesus and Mary as regards their power and their willingness to help us; but between the degree of readiness which men, keenly conscious of sin, naturally experience towards addressing one or the other. We must really maintain against Dr. Pusey that, though Montfort's expression of this thought is very beautiful, the thought itself is among the most obvious of truisms.

"It is, of course, an abuse of" Roman "teaching,"—elsewhere admits Dr. Pusey,—"when any confine their prayers to the Blessed Virgin." But, he adds, "a certain proportion, it has been ascertained by those who have inquired, do stop short in her" (p. 107). It is simply impossible, we reply, that any Catholic can "confine his prayers to" her, and "stop short in her," without falling into what the Church teaches to be mortal sin. Is he never then to make theological acts? never to prepare himself for confession? never to receive communion? Or—putting aside the question of mortal sin—do these devotees carefully avoid all visits to the Blessed Sacrament? to the Forty Hours' Exposition? to the solemnity of Benediction? "It has been ascertained" forsooth! by whom? when? where? how?

The author proceeds in one sentence, from a fact about which he can know nothing whatever, to a fact within his own personal cognizance; as though the two were equally undoubted.

"I have myself been asked by Roman Catholics to pray for my conversion. Once only I was asked to pray our Lord. On the other occasions, I was exclusively asked to pray the Blessed Virgin for it" (pp. 107–8).

Dr. Pusey himself very probably, if he were organizing prayers for some object he had closely at heart, would choose prominently prayers addressed to the Sacred Humanity. We should not on that account suspect him of the heretical tenet, that the soul of Christ possesses either a power or a will to help us,

commensurable with the Divine Power and Will. But we should understand him to see, that prayer to the Sacred Humanity is prayer to the Divine Person clothed in that Humanity; while it is far more attractive and easy for ordinary men, than prayer to the Invisible God. So prayer to Mary (as we have already explained) is virtually and ultimately prayer to God, while it is often more easy and attractive for ordinary men in their ordinary moments. "She is not the sun," Montfort says, "who blinds us because of our weakness, but fair and gentle as the moon, and more suitable therefore to our capacity."

We believe we have now gone through all Dr. Pusey's important objections against the worship of Mary, as practised by that class of Catholics to which those objections mainly refer. We will add a few words however, on two further classes who remain to be considered; viz., (1) interior, and (2) saintly men. We have already said—and the argument just brought to a close vindicates, we hope, our conclusion—that no one practice is more likely to raise an ordinary Catholic into a higher spiritual condition, than the frequent and sustained worship of Mary; because this secures prayer to God, offered in the most effective way. Now, so soon as a Catholic becomes interior—so soon as he begins to labour earnestly and consistently for a withdrawal of his affections from every earthly object—he is compelled (as it were) by the very necessity of his nature, to seek rest and satisfaction in thought of the Infinite. A direct remembrance of God, therefore, becomes a far more constant

phenomenon than it was at the earlier period, and pervades the whole current of his life. Let us suppose then, that he has been happily practised from the first in lively and frequent devotion to Mary: his thoughts of the Mother and the Son now become most intimately blended; he repeatedly contemplates the higher Object through the lower, as through a mirror; he becomes, to use Montfort's most touching expression, "the slave of Jesus in Mary." He is their slave, but their most loving slave. And so far from the latter love in any degree lessening the former,—on the contrary it singularly intensifies it, and gives to it an otherwise untasted quality of affection and tenderness. All this we here state without any attempt at proof: because our space is limited; and because Dr. Pusey (as we understand him) does not press his objections, as telling in the particular case of these higher and more advanced souls.

We will conclude then this particular portion of our argument, by two brief remarks closely connected with each other. They have been suggested, not by anything which Dr. Pusey has brought forward, but by the ordinary clamour of Protestant controversialists.

(1.) To speak of our Lady's mediation as encroaching ever so distantly on our Lord's mediatorial office, is to show so strangely inadequate a sense of what is included in the latter, that the very allegation confirms our worst impressions of Protestant misbelief. A year ago we expressed a confident opinion, that very few in Dr. Pusey's communion, except the extreme Trac-

tarians, in any way realize or practically hold that belief in our Lord's Divine Personality, which they speculatively accept; and we assigned, as one principal reason of this, the very circumstance of their neglecting devotion to the Most Holy Virgin. In our last number again we commented on a decidedly High Church writer, who accounts it blasphemy to hold that "Mary is the Mother of the Eternal." Canon Oakeley has some excellent remarks on this in p. 75. But we will quote in preference some admirable words of F. Newman, written several years ago, which cannot be too carefully pondered :—

"*Few Protestants have any real perception of the doctrine of God and man in one Person.* They speak in a dreamy, shadowy way of Christ's Divinity; but when their meaning is sifted, you will find them very slow to commit themselves to any statement sufficient to show that it is Catholic. They will tell you at once, that the subject is not to be inquired into, for that they cannot inquire into it at all, without being technical and subtile. Then when they comment on the Gospels, they will speak of Christ, not simply and consistently as God, but as a being made up of God and man, partly one and partly the other, or between both, or as a man inhabited by a special divine presence. Sometimes they even go on to deny that He was the Son of God in heaven, saying that He became the Son, when He was conceived of the Holy Ghost; and they are shocked, and think it a mark both of reverence and good sense to be shocked, when the Man is spoken of simply and plainly as God. They cannot bear to have it said, except as a figure or mode of speaking, that God had a human body, or that God suffered; they think that the 'Atonement,' and

'Sanctification through the Spirit,' as they speak, is the sum and substance of the Gospel, and they are shy of any dogmatic expression which goes beyond them. Such, I believe, is the character of the Protestant notions among us on the divinity of Christ, *whether among members of the Anglican communion or dissenters from it, excepting a section of the former*" ("Discourses to Mixed Congregations," "The Glories of Mary for the sake of her Son.")

(2.) The notion that Roman Catholics practically regard our Lady as a "goddess," is repugnant, not merely to carefully-ascertained truths, but to the most superficial phenomena. The very cause of that special attraction which her devotion possesses for the great body of Catholics, is their regarding her as a fellow-creature. She can obtain for them all they ask; while they feel that in praying to her they are not speaking (as it were) face to face with their Infinite Creator.

III.

Hitherto, we have laboured to defend that devotion to our Blessed Lady which (as it seems to us) the Church magisterially, and therefore infallibly, recommends to all her children. In April, after recounting the doctrines implied in that devotion, we thus proceeded:—

"There are other propositions which, if not actually taught by the Church with infallible authority, are yet so universally held by devout servants of Mary, that no 'cordatus Catholicus' will dream of doubting them. For instance, (1) that God secured her assent as an indispensable preliminary to the Incarnation

('fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum') which otherwise would not have been accomplished; (2) that while our Lord was on earth, she had a clear knowledge of, and keen sympathy with, all which He effected for our salvation; (3) that she takes a most active part in dispensing the gift of perseverance; (4) that extraordinary tenderness towards her is a special note of predestination."

Here, as before, previously to examining objections, we must consider the positive ground for accepting these four propositions. We say this, then. If a number of holy men, deeply imbued with the spirit of the Church; profoundly and largely acquainted with the text of Scripture; and specially given to a loving meditation of Mary;—if these men are unanimous in arriving at certain conclusions, and if not one such man can be named who dissents therefrom, an overpowering probability is recognised by every loyal Catholic that these propositions are true. Then, to take them severally. The Scriptural argument ordinarily adduced for the first, is excellently expressed by Canon Oakeley in p. 24. The second is almost necessarily implied in the patristic tradition, so powerfully drawn out by F. Newman, on Mary's office as the second Eve; for how could the former occupy a place in man's Redemption, analogous to that occupied by Eve in his fall, unless she had a clear knowledge of and sympathy with, the great work in progress? The third proposition has been in effect defended by F. Newman. See, e.g., pp. 418–423. Again, in p. 452 he argues:—

"Our Lord died for those heathens who did not know Him; and His Mother intercedes for those Christians who do not know her: and she intercedes according to His will; when He wills to save a particular soul, she at once prays for it."

She prays for it, because God has made it part of her sweet office, that from the first moment of her Assumption, she shall have an integral part in the salvation of each predestined soul.

We are not aware of any special objection raised by Dr. Pusey against any one of these three propositions; and we proceed, therefore, to the fourth: in regard to which our main argument must turn, neither on defending its truth, nor replying to difficulties, but on investigating its real sense. F. Newman quotes the following words from F. Nepveu, S.J.:—

"The love of Jesus Christ is the most sure pledge of our future happiness, and the most infallible token of our predestination. Mercy towards the poor, devotion to the Holy Virgin, are very sensible tokens of predestination; nevertheless they are not absolutely infallible: but one cannot have a sincere and constant love of Jesus Christ, without being predestinated . . . The destroying angel, which bereaved the houses of the Egyptians of their first-born, had respect to all the houses which were marked with the blood of the Lamb" (p. 441).

F. Newman adds, "I believe this is a fair specimen of the teaching of our spiritual books." Now there can be here no possible difference of *doctrine* between any one Catholic and any other. That if you have a

sincere and genuine love of Christ, such a fact supplies immeasurably stronger ground of hope as to your salvation, than could possibly be supplied by any devotion to our Lady which is *separated* from such love,—this is a truth which no Catholic could hear questioned without horror. Yet, on the other hand, it does seem to us (but we speak quite diffidently and under correction) that it is very far more common in Catholic writers to mention "devotion to the Holy Virgin," than "the love of Jesus Christ," as a special note of predestination. Here is one instance out of many. F. Newman (p. 449) quotes a prayer to Mary from the Raccolta saying, "to love thee is a great mark of predestination:" but he quotes no such indulgenced prayer addressed to our Blessed Lord; nor have we ourselves observed one. And we suspect the reason of all this to be, that the phrase "note of predestination" is not commonly used exactly in F. Newman's sense. We give our own impression for what it may be worth; assuring Dr. Pusey meanwhile, that as to the question of *doctrine*, no Catholic could dream of holding any other than that above stated.

Firstly then, and as a previous illustration, consider the word "devotion." We think it is not ordinarily used as expressing any habits of prayer which are *obligatory;* but those only to which a Catholic freely resorts, according to the instinct of his own piety. Thus we speak of "devotion to Mary," but hardly of "devotion to Jesus." What we do speak of in regard to Him is rather "devotion to the Passion;" or "to the Sacred Heart;" or "to the Blessed Sacra-

ment;" or "to the Holy Infancy;" or (to speak of a recent devotion which has shown itself in some parts of Catholic Christendom) "to His Holy Countenance." This proposition, then,—"devotion to Mary is a special note of predestination,"—shows by its very wording that reference is not made to any matter of strict obligation.

But, further, it appears to us that those exercises which *are* matters of strict obligation, have a connection with predestination even closer than that of being "notes," thereof. It is not commonly said, e.g., that *frequentation of the Sacraments* is "a note of predestination." Such matters would rather be called "the very *path* of predestination." That Catholic is predestined, and he only, who continues to the end in his love of God and of Jesus Christ, and in his frequentation of the Sacraments: or who, so often as he falls therefrom, recovers himself, and dies in that state of recovery. But the question may naturally suggest itself to him, "Is my love for God and for Jesus Christ of that *kind*,—so deep, and genuine, and stable—that I have reasonable ground for hoping that it will continue? Have I any special *note* of my predestination?" And the answer given is, that if my love for Jesus is associated with a peculiar tenderness to His Blessed Mother, I have greater security than by any other assignable mark, that it will last me to the end. And, in accordance with this, the prayer to our Lady, quoted by F. Newman from the Raccolta, after having said, "to love thee is a great mark of predestination," proceeds, "pray

that I may have a great love for Jesus;" "I covet no good of the earth, but to love my God Alone." And that, in this sense of the phrase, a heartfelt love for the Blessed Virgin is a most special note of predestination, has been established (we hope) in the earlier part of our article.

From what has here been incidentally said, we may explain an episcopal statement, which Dr. Pusey has singularly misunderstood. The italics are our own:—

"To judge from the official answers of the Bishops to Pius IX. in answer to his inquiry, 'with what devotion your clergy and faithful people are animated towards the Conception of the Immaculate Virgin?' Faber was right as to the immensely greater devotion and trust in the Blessed Virgin, at least in countries where there is no check from the contact with Protestants. Certainly the prominent impression in my mind from reading those answers (they occupy more than three close volumes) was '*if the devotion to God were like that to the Blessed Virgin, it would be a world of saints.*' 'In this diocese,' says the Bishop of Cochabamba, 'as in the whole of civilized America, it has attained to the highest degree, so that nothing more can be desired.' 'Our only hope in these countries, tried by divers tribulations,' says the Vicar Apostolic in Cochin China, 'is placed in our most holy Mother, from whom we expect salvation [salus].' 'The devotion of the Blessed Virgin is such as is to be defined by no bounds,' says the Bishop of Scutari. In Spain and Portugal devotion to the Blessed Virgin is in its natural home. They are familiarly called Marian kingdoms" (pp. 119–20).

Dr. Pusey has understood e.g. the Bishop of Cochabamba to mean, that the whole population of

civilized America are faithful servants to the Mother of God. Yet surely he cannot suppose that prelate to hold, either on the one hand, that the whole population is free from mortal sin; or else, on the other hand, that men plunged in mortal sin can be faithful servants to the Mother of God. Dr. Pusey's whole misconception, we think, arises from his misunderstanding this word "devotion." A population which did not recognise our *Blessed Lord* as the legitimate Object of worship, would not be Catholic at all; but "devotion" to Mary is not of strict obligation. Yet in the countries of civilized America frequent and habitual prayer to Mary is universally recognised, as no less integral a part of religious practice, than frequent and habitual prayer to Christ. "Nothing more can be desired" in this respect; and the blessedness of such a circumstance is extremely great.

And this will be a convenient place for another episodical remark. F. Newman's Jesuit director at Rome said to him, "You cannot love Mary too much, if you love our Lord a great deal more" (p. 373). On the other hand, F. Faber (we think in the "All for Jesus") speaks to this effect: "Our love of Mary may be wrong *in kind*, but cannot exceed *in degree*." There can be absolutely no difference between Catholics in their real *feeling* on this head; the only question concerns the true *analysis* of that feeling. We suggest the question in this case, for better judges than ourselves to ponder: but of the two, we rather incline to F. Faber's analysis. Let a true, not a false, image of Mary be presented by the intellect, and the

will cannot by possibility be too strongly attracted to the object thus depicted.

IV.

We now proceed to various thoughts and expressions, quoted by Dr. Pusey from individual writers of greater or less weight. And these, as regards authority, are divisible into four different classes.

Firstly we have those of holy men—such as S. Alphonsus and the Venerable Grignon de Montfort,—whose works have been carefully examined by supreme authority, with a view to prospective canonization. Of these every Catholic is absolutely certain that they contain nothing contrary to faith or morals; or to the Church's common sentiment; or to the Church's common practice.* At the same time, let it be most carefully observed, the Church has in no respect implied that the various propositions contained in these works are *true*, but only that they are neither theologically unsound nor abnormal. If, then (as may often be the case), there is any Catholic to whom such propositions do not commend themselves as edifying;—or (still more) who finds that the

* The law is conceived in these terms, "If the person whose beatification is in question, has written books, "no inquiry must be proceeded with until these books have been diligently examined in the Sacred Congregation of Rites, to see if they contain errors against faith or good morals, or any new doctrine contrary to the Church's common sentiment or her common practice."—"Analecta Juris Pontificii," tom. i. p. 737.

very thought of them perplexes and discomposes him;—he would be exhorted by every good director to banish them from his mind while it remains so disposed. Indeed we believe as a matter of fact, that comparatively few Catholics, either here or abroad, have ever heard of those propositions on which Dr. Pusey lays most stress; for, as Canon Oakeley has most justly remarked, they "represent rather the shape into which men of ascetic lives and profoundly spiritual minds are accustomed to cast their thoughts, than the standard of our customary preaching or the scale of general devotion" (p. 34). At the same time it is undoubtedly the bias of our own judgment, not merely that the propositions cited by Dr. Pusey from these holy men are entirely *true*, but also that they are generally edifying; that solid piety, unworldliness, and love of the Incarnate God would be greatly promoted, if a far larger number of Catholics were trained really to study and appreciate these most elevated thoughts and most burning words. We shall incidentally touch on this in the sequel.

A second class of propositions cited by Dr. Pusey have been expressed century after century, in a shape substantially similar, by eminent and approved writers, and cannot possibly be unknown to Pope and bishops; while at the same time they have never been at all discouraged, and still less visited with any kind of censure. By such significant silence, as it seems to us, the Church implies—not indeed that they are *true* (very far from it)—but that they are not

theologically unsound, nor in themselves injurious to piety.

A third class of these propositions have been expressed by this or that individual writer, and such writer may have been in general orthodox and Catholic; yet there may be no reason whatever to think that they have been brought before the notice of ecclesiastical authority. Such propositions may imaginably be unsound or even heretical; they carry with them no extrinsic weight; they must stand or fall on their own merits.

Lastly a work may have been actually condemned and placed on the Index: in which case, of course, the Church will have anticipated Dr. Pusey's censure. And such in fact has here been the case in one instance. Canon Oakeley observed in his pamphlet (p. 21, note) that no Catholic he had met with had ever heard the name of Oswald; and after this was written, Mr. Rhodes opportunely discovered that name on the Index.

Now it is evidently impossible, within the limits of one article, to treat separately every single passage adduced by Dr. Pusey; but the course which we purpose to pursue, will be admitted by every one as equitable and fair. We will consider every one of those *general propositions* against which he most severely inveighs; and we will face severally every one of those *individual passages* adduced by him, which are presumably the most difficult of explanation. Firstly then let us treat the general propositions which fall under Dr. Pusey's lash.

"(1) We had heard before, repeatedly, that Mary was the Mediatrix with the Redeemer; some of us, who do not read Marian books, have heard now for the first time, that she was even our 'Co-Redemptress.' The evidence lies, not in any insulated passage of a devotional writer . . . . *but in formal answers from archbishops and bishops to the Pope* as to what they desired in regard to the declaration of the Immaculate Conception as an article of faith. Thus the Archbishop of Syracuse wrote: 'Since we know certainly that she, in the fulness of time, was *Co-Redemptress of the human race*, together with her Son Jesus Christ our Lord.' From North Italy the Bishop of Asti wrote of 'the dogma of the singular privilege granted by the Divine Redeemer to His pure Mother, *the Co-Redemptress of the world*.' In South Italy the Bishop of Gallipoli wrote, 'the human race whom the Son of God, from her, redeemed; whom, together with Him, *she herself co-redeemed*.' The Bishop of Cariati prayed the Pope to 'command all the sons of Holy Mother Church and thy own, that no one of them shall dare at any time hereafter to suspect as to the Immaculate Conception *of their Co-Redemptress*.' From Sardinia the Bishop of Alghero wrote: 'It is the common consent of all the faithful, and the common wish and desire of all, that our so beneficent Parent and *Co-Redemptress* should be presented by the Apostolic See with the honour of this most illustrious mystery.' In Spain the Bishop of Almeria justified the attribute by appeal to the service of the Conception. 'The Church,—adapting to the Mother of God in the office of the Conception that text, "Let us make a help like unto Him,"—assures us of it, and confirms those most ancient traditions, "Companion of the Redeemer," "Co-Redemptress," "Authoress of everlasting salvation."' The bishops refer to these as ancient, well-known, traditionary titles, at least in their Churches

in North and South Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, Spain" (pp. 151–3).

Dr. Pusey might have inserted, in further corroboration of this doctrine, the indulgenced prayer which we have already quoted, that "*by the merits of Jesus and His Virgin Mother*, we may be partakers of the Resurrection." (Raccolta, p. 275.) And we are the more surprised at his objection to this title of Co-Redemptress, as he has quoted from Salazar the following beautiful explanation of its purport:—

"The ways in which the Blessed Virgin co-operated with Christ to the salvation of the world may be classed as three:—

"1. As far as she so sacrificed herself to God for the salvation of the world by the wish and longing for death and the cross, that, if it could be, she too, for the salvation of the universe, was willing to co-die (commori) with her Son, and to meet a like death with Him.

"2. and chiefly, whereby the Virgin gave her help to Christ for the common salvation, in that she, exhibiting a will altogether conformable and concordant with the will of Christ, gave her Son to death for the common salvation. And her zeal for the human race is not seen only therein, that it made her will conspire with the will of her Son, but also in that she excited and impelled Him to undergo death.

"3. That she acted as mediatrix with the Mediator. The work of our salvation was so wrought. The Virgin expressed to her Son the wishes and desires which she had conceived for the salvation of the human race; but the Son, deferring to the Mother, received these, and again presented to the Father the desires both of His Mother and His own; but the

Father granted what was wished, first to the Son, then to the Mother" (p. 154).*

For ourselves we are disposed to accept the whole of this as *true;* but we are here only maintaining, that it contains nothing contradictory to Christian doctrine or intrinsically dangerous. If we could only guess what is Dr. Pusey's reason for thinking otherwise, we might answer that reason; but as things are, we await his further explanation. Canon Oakeley (p. 24) excellently vindicates the title of Co-Redemptress.

The other general propositions, condemned by Dr. Pusey, undoubtedly require more careful consideration. We will next (2) consider the statement (Eirenicon, p. 105) that she "appeases her Son's just anger:" whence Dr. Pusey infers that, according to writers who so express themselves, "the Saints are more ready to intercede with Jesus than Jesus with the Father;" or (in other words) that Mary in particular loves sinners more warmly than Jesus loves them. But here, as in so many other instances, the parallel of the Incarnation is precisely in point. Dr. Pusey may hear many Anglican preachers say that "the Father is justly irritated," and that "the Son appeases His wrath." Does he therefore ascribe to them the portentous heresy, that sinners are loved with less intensity by the Divine Nature than by the soul of Christ? The Incarnation

* [A still fuller account of what the name "Co-redemptress" implies, is given by F. Jeanjacquot, S.J. A notice of his little work appears in a subsequent page of the present volume.]

displays no less truly the Father's loving-kindness than the Son's. "God *so loved the world* that He gave His only-begotten Son:" "God *commends His Love*, in that Christ died for us:" and any different tenet appertains only to a Calvinistic heretic. Nevertheless it is said with a most true *drift*, in practical and devotional writing, that the Son appeases the Father's wrath, and the like: because such phrases are understood to signify what is most true; viz. that in consequence of the Incarnation, the Father forgives us our sins, and treats us with immeasurably greater mercy than would otherwise have been the case. It is most certain indeed, that the love felt for men by the Father is infinitely greater than that felt for them by the soul of Christ; and in like manner, that the love felt for them by the soul of Christ is very far greater even than that felt for them by their Heavenly Mother. Still it is axiomatically evident, that if Mary's intercession has any efficacy at all, it must induce her Son to treat men more mercifully than would otherwise have been the case; and therefore, just as it is very suitably said that the Son appeases the Father's wrath, so it is said with precisely equal propriety that Mary appeases her Son's.

Under this head comes the vision of the two ladders (pp. 103–4, note). Let us suppose some Anglican poet to depict "a vision touching the two ladders that reached from earth to heaven: the one red, upon which the Eternal Father leaned, from which many fell backward, and could not ascend: the other white, upon which the Sacred Humanity leaned; the help whereof,

such as used, were by Jesus received with a cheerful countenance, and so with facility ascended into heaven." The only unfavourable comment on this which we should expect from Dr. Pusey would be that, in saying "*many* fell backward" from the former ladder, the poet implied the existence of some who did *not* fall backward from it. Otherwise he would heartily applaud such a poem; as teaching the all-important truth, that Jesus is the one appointed Way for coming to the Father, and that those who attempt to reach the Father without that mediation will be disappointed. Such then is the parallel meaning of S. Alphonsus, and of those other saintly writers who have appealed to this vision. They teach that, to a Catholic, Mary is immeasurably the surest way of reaching Jesus; that those Catholics who neglect her regular and habitual invocation, will find it incomparably more difficult to obtain sanctification and salvation, and will, far more commonly than not, fail in the attempt.

(3.) "God retained justice to Himself, and granted mercy to her" (p. 105). "God has resigned into her hands (if one might say so) His Omnipotence in the sphere of grace" (p. 103). "To her He has committed the kingdom of mercy, reserving to Himself that of justice." This latter is perhaps the commonest shape in which the idea is expressed; but that idea is of course one and the same. Such phrases convey a meaning, either on the one hand intolerable and heretical, or on the other hand beautiful and edifying, according to the sense in which they are taken. They may *in themselves* mean, that our Lord has in

such sense given to Mary the kingdom of mercy, as *to have abdicated that kingdom Himself;* that mercy and grace can no longer be obtained by addressing Him directly, but only by invoking His Mother. Such a notion, no Catholic need be told, would be nothing less than an appalling blasphemy. We need only say therefore, that no one but an enemy ever dreamed of so understanding the statement; that the holy men who most constantly uttered it, were also foremost in inculcating those prayers, e.g., to the Blessed Sacrament and the Sacred Heart, which are absolutely inconsistent with its false interpretation; and that they are even more ardent and glowing than other Catholics, in their description of those unspeakable mercies which flow from prayer offered to the Sacred Humanity. In one of Mr. Rhodes's invaluable letters, he exhibits this fact in the particular instance of S. Alphonsus:—

"It is the same as regards S. Alphonsus. It would indeed be impossible to find in all his voluminous writings a passage of such severity as the one which Dr. Pusey quotes from M. Olier. Still in the 'Glories of Mary' there occur a few quotations which speak very strongly of our Lord's office as our Judge as well as Saviour. Dr. Pusey tells his readers of these, but he does not tell them of the explanatory passages to be found in the selfsame volume. For instance, cap. iii. 1. 'The King of Heaven, being Infinite Goodness, *desires in the highest degree to enrich us with His graces; but, because confidence is requisite on our part,* and in order to increase it in us, He has given us His own Mother to be our Mother and advocate.' Of this and similar passages Dr. Pusey says nothing; nor

does he speak of the veritable ocean of love and confidence in our Lord, elsewhere manifested throughout the writings of this great Saint, and by which the few sentences, strongly setting forth His severity to sinners, are absolutely overwhelmed. It is hopeless to attempt more than the most imperfect samples of them. Open, for instance, his Reflections on the Passion of our Lord. In the very first chapter we find him stating that 'our Lord declared to St. Gertrude that He was ready to die as many deaths as there were souls in hell if He could save them.' In chapter xiv. he says, 'Jesus Christ did not cease with His death to intercede for us before the Eternal Father. He still at present is our advocate: and it seems as if in heaven (as St. Paul writes) He knew no other office than that of moving His Father to show us mercy; 'always living to intercede for us' (Heb. vii.). And, adds the Apostle, the Saviour for this end has ascended into Heaven 'that He may appear in the presence of God for us'' (Heb. ix.). And, further on, 'My justice (said God to Mary Mgd. de Pazzi) is changed into clemency by the vengeance taken on the innocent flesh of Jesus Christ. The blood of this My Son does not cry to Me for vengeance like that of Abel, but it only cries for mercy and pity, and at His voice my justice cannot but remain appeased.' Again, a little further on, S. Alphonsus puts into the mouth of our Lord these tender words:—'My little lamb (pecorella mia), fear not; see what thou hast cost Me; I hold thee written in my hands in these wounds that I have borne for thee; these ever remind me to help thee and to defend thee from thy enemies; love Me and have confidence.' And the sinner answers:—'Yes, Jesus, I love You, and I confide in You. It is your will that all should be saved, and that none should perish. Even should You drive me, O my love, from your face, I will not cease to hope in You, for You

are my Saviour. I love You, O dear Jesus; I love You, and I hope.' "

There remains then the true sense of the statement we are considering. Christ has reserved wholly to Himself the kingdom of justice; He has given to His Mother no lot or part whatever in the office of judging and condemning. But He has so unreservedly handed over to her His whole kingdom of mercy, that she possesses (as it is often expressed) "omnipotentia supplex;" that the invocation of her will be fully as effective in obtaining mercy and grace, as would be prayer to Him offered with the same dispositions. To all therefore, who feel themselves bowed down by a sense of sin, she is a truly attractive object of worship: in some sense more attractive than her Son; because her office is exclusively that of mercy, and *within* that sphere He has communicated to her His full power.

(4.) "'To sinners who have lost divine grace, there is no more sun' (the symbol of Jesus) 'for him, but the moon is still on the horizon; let him address himself to Mary'" (p. 106). "'No sinner doth deserve that Christ should any more make intercession for him with the Father . . . and therefore it was necessary that Christ should constitute His well-beloved Mother a mediatrix between us and Him'" (p. 105). We frankly admit that we have more difficulty in seeing the precise sense of these expressions, than of any others brought against Catholics. Undoubtedly indeed, if one found such words without any indication of authorship, one might very naturally understand them to mean, that he who has fallen into mortal sin commits grievous

presumption in offering direct prayer to God; and that God would have had no power to remit mortal sin, if He had not created Mary to intercede for it. But since notoriously every Catholic in the world would regard either of these propositions with horror unspeakable—and since the words were addressed by a Catholic to Catholics—it is demonstratively certain, that neither writer nor readers understood any such blasphemy. In fact, the writer was able to use such strong language, precisely *because* no one of his readers could by possibility take his words in their literal sense. It is as though a son said to his mother, "You are the author of my being; in you is my only hope;" and Dr. Pusey forthwith pounced on him for blasphemously introducing a second deity.

It is absolutely certain then, that these words do not mean what Dr. Pusey supposes; but it is more difficult to say accurately what they do mean. On the whole however, we cannot be wrong in giving them some such interpretation as the following. "If you have once possessed the unspeakable blessedness of justification and adoption, and have fallen from that blessedness by deliberately outraging your Creator with mortal sin, you have nothing favourable to expect from God's *Justice*. With no approach to injustice, God might remove you straightway from earth to hell; there is nothing bought for you by Christ in His Passion, which could preclude your Creator from so acting. You must sue then for favours, which Christ has *not* secured for you by His Passion; you must throw yourself unreservedly on His Mercy; and

you have more hope of forgiveness, in proportion as you more keenly realize this fact. Yet this very keenness of realization may injure you, unless you adopt the appointed remedy: your sense of the insult you have offered to God may make you feel as though there were 'no sun in the horizon;' may make you slow in apprehending the boundless mercy of Him who is to be your Judge. He has Himself provided for this your obvious need. He has appointed a mediatrix, who entertains for you no feeling but that of pity; and whose maternal love will strengthen and encourage you to approach her Son. Nor is this all; for her prayers have a most powerful effect in obtaining for you a far greater degree of mercy, than He would otherwise have granted."

(5.) "By dying He obeyed not only His Father, but also His Mother" (p. 158). "All things are subject to the command of the Virgin, even God Himself." "The Blessed Virgin is superior to God, and God Himself is subject to her, in respect of the manhood which He assumed from her." "However she be subject unto God inasmuch as she is a creature, yet she is said to be superior and placed over Him,* inasmuch as she is His Mother." "You have over God the authority of a mother, and hence you obtain pardon for the most obdurate sinners" (p. 103, note).

Dr. Pusey is often so severe on Catholics for going

* We assume that the Latin word is "prælata." Dr. Pusey translates it "preferred before Him;" but our rendering of the text is plainly more correct.

beyond Scripture, that one might have expected considerable forbearance where they have but used New Testament language. S. Luke says (c. 2, v. 51), "He came to Nazareth, and was subject to them." Who was "He"? The Incarnate God. Who were "they"? Mary and Joseph. Now Dr. Pusey, in p. 103, expresses himself as though the very phrase "God is subject to Mary" were so plainly revolting, as to require no express refutation: yet it is almost word for word the Holy Ghost's statement through S. Luke. Moreover, to say that the Incarnate God was subject to Mary and Joseph, is simply and precisely saying in other words that they were "superiors" "set over" the Incarnate God. We have it then, on the Holy Ghost's infallible authority, that during certain years the Incarnate God was subject to His Mother; that she was "superior" to Him; "set over Him;" "had over Him the authority of a mother."

There are probably many in the Church of England who, if they saw this argument of ours, would at once object, that our Lord was only placed under Mary and Joseph during His nonage, before His faculties were fully developed. But Dr. Pusey holds of course, as strongly as we do, that from the very moment of His miraculous Conception the soul of Christ knew every object which it knows even at this very moment. Other Protestants again are more or less consciously under the impression, that since our Lord's Ascension His Sacred Humanity has in some sense ceased to be; but Dr. Pusey here again would heartily anathematize any such heresy.

Let us begin then, by examining what the Holy Ghost meant in S. Luke's words. This of course is certain: that at every moment there was this or that particular act, which the Eternal Father wished the soul of Christ to elicit; and also that this precise act did, in fact, always take place. One cannot suppose however, consistently with S. Luke's language (to put it on no other ground), that the commands of Mary and Joseph were constantly overruled by the superior claim of God's Will; and still less can we suppose that that Will surrendered its claim to *them*. One only supposition then remains, which is unquestionably the true one. God so inspired Mary and Joseph, that whenever they commanded Jesus, such command was precisely accordant with the Divine preference: and Jesus, among the various motives which at that moment influenced His human will, vouchsafed to direct His act to this particular motive also—viz., the virtuousness of obeying His Mother; and of obeying him too, whom God had appointed to stand in the place of an earthly father.

Now firstly we ask, what possible difficulty there can be in supposing that the same obedience was paid by Jesus to Mary's authority at a somewhat later period; viz., when He entered on His Passion? that He prepared Himself for this, by asking her permission? that "by dying He obeyed not only His Father but also His Mother?" We are not here arguing that He did so: though for ourselves we have every disposition to believe that He did so. But we ask, what possible *theological objection* can be raised

against such an opinion, should it commend itself to some holy man? Canon Oakeley (pp. 24–25) points out the plain implication of Scripture, that at the Annunciation "she must express her free and unbiassed consent, before the human race can be redeemed in the manner fore-ordained of God;" and he then proceeds:—

"Nor can I see (though I admit this to be rather the pious inference of devotion, than the logical conclusion of dogma) that any more direct share in the unapproachable office of our Redeemer is ascribed to His Blessed Mother *in regarding the Passion itself as suspended upon her consent*, than is implied in the intimacy thus proved by the language of Scripture itself to have existed from the first between the decrees of the most Holy Trinity and the free-will of the Blessed Virgin" (p. 25).

Then, following Jesus and Mary from earth to heaven, something still surely remains in their mutual relations, not identical indeed (far from it), yet not unanalogous. Take the parallel of an absolute monarch, whose mother still lives and is fondly loved by him. He possesses over her undoubtedly supreme authority: so far from her being able in any true sense to command him, he can impose his commands on her without appeal. And yet his assent to her just petitions will not altogether resemble in kind his assent to other suppliants; he will regard her still with a real filial deference; and she will, in a figurative sense, exercise over him a certain maternal authority. This is the obvious sense of the expressions cited by Dr. Pusey.

If to any Catholic such expressions appear strained and far-fetched, he is in no way called on to adopt or even think of them. For our own part, it seems to us most touching and appropriate, that earnest devotees of Mary should delight in setting forth, exalting, amplifying, her various unapproached and singular prerogatives.

We may add here, as in the former case, that the paradoxical form itself which such expressions wear, shows clearly how far it was from the mind of their originators that they should be construed literally. In every case a Catholic in a Catholic country was addressing Catholics, who could never dream of suspecting him to mean what both he and they knew to be heretical. No one, e.g., more abounds in such expressions than S. Alphonsus; and, indeed, one of Dr. Pusey's quotations is taken from him. The simplicity then is almost affecting, with which that Saint elsewhere expresses himself.

"There is no doubt (he says) that figures, like hyperboles, cannot be taxed with falsehood, when *by the context of the discourse the exaggeration is evident:* as for example when S. Peter Damianus says that Mary comes to her Son, *commanding, not beseeching* . . . . So then figures are permitted, *wherever there cannot be any mistake* on the subject."—(French Translation of works, vol. vi. p. 324.)*

* [Cardinal Newman, in his recent republication of his Anglican writings on the "Via Media" (vol. ii. p. 121, note), has most serviceably cited a Decree of the Inquisition on this subject, dated February 28, 1875. These are his words :—"After reprehending the title 'Queen of the Heart of Jesus' used by a certain pious

Nor, in our opinion, can it be said with truth, that such devout contemplations and pious amplifications and figurative expressions are, at all events, less suitable to the present age. They are out of harmony indeed with the spirit of the present age, simply because no age ever needed them more. The one festering evil which in these days eats like a canker into men's spirituality, is the spirit of worldliness; from which flows that foul stream of indifferentism, against which the Holy Father is never weary of inveighing. Now it is in proportion as the invisible world is made attractive to the imagination and the feelings, that there is the greater hope of its successfully overcoming the charm of things present and transitory. It is precisely then such meditations as those of S. Bernardine and S. Alphonsus,—originating with holy men and diffused like a tradition among the body of believers,—which are among the most valuable bulwarks against that formidable foe now so rampantly in the field.

(6.) "It seems to be a part of this [evil] system to parallel the Blessed Virgin throughout with her Divine

Sodality, the Decree goes on to observe that the Sacred Congregation has before now 'warned and reprehended' those who, by such language, 'have not conformed to the right Catholic sense,' but 'ascribe power to her, as issuing from her divine maternity, beyond its due limits'; and that 'although she has the greatest influence with her Son, still it cannot be piously affirmed that she exercises command over Him.'" I need hardly add however, that such a Decree can in no way touch those who—after the example of S. Alphonsus—avowedly use the phrase in an exclusively figurative sense.]

Son, so that every prerogative which belonged to Him by nature or office should be, in some measure, imputed to her" (p. 161). Can there be a more unfortunate comment than this? If you earnestly love two objects, it is a delight to trace every possible analogy and similarity between them; between their circumstances, their character, their benefits to you: and the fact therefore, to which Dr. Pusey draws attention, shows how dearly the lovers of Mary love her Son. But who, except through a quite strange theological prejudice, would dream of drawing the very opposite conclusion? of inferring that Catholics elevate the Mother into her Son's rival and antagonist?

(7.) Dr. Pusey complains of S. Alphonsus giving the obvious counsel, that Catholics shall ascribe to the Blessed Virgin every privilege which they *can* ascribe to her without theological error. Well, at all events there can be no *theological error* in ascribing to her all those privileges, which you can ascribe to her *without* theological error. And if Dr. Pusey happily becomes a Catholic, he will only be expected to abstain from accusing this opinion of theological error; he will not be expected to embrace it himself.

(8.) We now come to Dr. Pusey's complaint against F. Faber, for saying that "an immense increase of devotion to Mary," "nothing less than an immense one," is among the most desirable of eventualities. First then one has to consider, what was F. Faber's *authority* for thus speaking; because, if this were merely his own private bias of opinion, there would be no great need of entering on the discussion. Let it be

remembered however where the words occur. F. Faber had been translating a book, of which it has been authoritatively decided at Rome that it contains nothing contrary to faith or morals, or to the Church's common sentiment and common practice. (See note at page 61.) The words cited by Dr. Pusey occur in F. Faber's preface to that work; and they do but say what Ven. Grignon de Montfort earnestly inculcates. Look at such passages as the following in the work itself.

"All the rich among the people shall supplicate thy face from age to age, and *particularly at the end of the world;* that is to say, the greatest Saints, the souls richest in graces and virtues, shall be the most assiduous in praying to our Blessed Lady, and in having her always present as their perfect model to imitate, and their powerful aid to give them succour.

"I have said that this would come to pass, particularly at the end of the world, and indeed presently, because *the Most High with His holy Mother* has to form for Himself great Saints, *who shall surpass most of the other Saints in sanctity, as much as the cedars of Lebanon outgrow the little shrubs,* as has been revealed to a holy soul, whose life has been written by a great servant of God.

"These great souls, full of grace and zeal, shall be chosen to match themselves against the enemies of God, who shall rage on all sides; and they shall be *singularly devout to our Blessed Lady,* illuminated by her light, nourished by her milk, led by her spirit, supported by her arm, and sheltered under her protection, so that they shall fight with one hand and build with the other. With one hand they shall fight, overthrow, and crush the heretics with their heresies,

the schismatics with their schisms, the idolaters with their idolatries, and the sinners with their impieties. With the other hand *they shall build the temple of the true Solomon, and the mystical city of God; that is to say, the most holy Virgin,* called by the holy Fathers the temple of Solomon and the city of God. By their words and by their examples *they shall bend the whole world to true devotion to Mary.* This shall bring upon them many enemies; but it shall also bring many victories and much glory for God alone. It is this which God revealed to S. Vincent Ferrer, the great apostle of his age, as he has sufficiently noted in one of his works" (pp. 25–7).

"God, then, wishes to *reveal and discover* Mary, the masterpiece of His hands, *in these latter times*" (p. 28).

"It is necessary, then, for the greater knowledge and glory of the Most Holy Trinity, that Mary *should be more known than ever.*

"Mary must *shine forth more than ever* in mercy, in might, and in grace, *in these latter times*" (p. 29).

"The power of Mary over all the devils *will especially break out in the latter times,* when Satan will lay his snares against her heel; that is to say, her humble slaves and her poor children, whom she will raise up to make war against him" (p. 33).

"God wishes that His holy Mother should be at present *more known, more loved, more honoured, than she has ever been.* This no doubt will take place, if the predestinate enter, with the grace and light of the Holy Ghost, into the interior and perfect practice which I will disclose to them shortly" (p. 33).

Now we are as far as possible from denying, that every Catholic has the fullest liberty to think all this utterly mistaken. We only say that F. Faber had an equal right to think it true; and that Dr. Pusey, in denouncing it as *intolerable and unsound,* is

assailing the Catholic Church herself. Any Catholic, we repeat, may regard the holy writer as thoroughly *mistaken;* but when Dr. Pusey denounces him as theologically *unsound,* all Catholics are called on to protest against such strictures.

And now as to the statement itself. We know not on what ground Montfort based his predictions as to the future; nor are we acquainted with those "revelations of the saints" to which F. Faber alludes: as to the matter of *fact* therefore, we can have no opinion whatever. But on the matter of *doctrine,* nothing can be more intelligible than Montfort's and Faber's view. It has often been said by approved ascetical writers, that the most effective and acceptable way of contemplating Jesus, is the uniting with His Mother in that contemplation; that the thought of Jesus and of Mary should be indissolubly blended together. But now take the ordinary books of prayer and meditation: who can possibly say that the constant union of these two Objects is carried out to one-hundredth part of the extent, which is most readily imaginable? It was Montfort's strong opinion that the time was come when this should be vigorously done; moreover, that its certain result would be a greatly-increased knowledge of Mary, and by consequence a greatly-increased love of Jesus. So far from there being aught alarming or extravagant in such an opinion, it might with greater plausibility be described (though *we* certainly should not so describe it) as the obvious dictate of common sense.

At the same time we must be never weary of repeat-

ing, that all the propositions treated in this particular portion of our article are purely *open* propositions; that neither Dr. Pusey, nor any one else whom the Holy Ghost may draw to the Church, need trouble his head about them; that he would only be expected to abstain from censuring them, and to allow in others the same liberty which he exercises himself. Even now he seems ready to do this in the case of Italians and Spaniards: * why then are English lovers of Mary to be placed under a yoke? There are many Englishmen who feel that such worship of Mary as is counselled by the more "extreme" school, is a priceless benefit to their whole spiritual life: why are they to forfeit their privilege, because Dr. Pusey finds his own case different? All such tyrannical and dictatorial proclivities Dr. Pusey doubtless must renounce, before he can be a loyal member of the Roman Catholic Church.

But we must not shrink from encountering the actual passages textually quoted by Dr. Pusey from Catholic writers. Our only difficulty in treating separately each one of these, is the physical impossibility of doing so in one article. But since the Eirenicon was published, a selection has been made of those propositions which, as they stand in its pages, are considered to present the greatest difficulty to a

* These were his words addressed to the "Weekly Register": "It is not for us to prescribe to Italians or Spaniards what they shall hold, or how they shall express their pious opinions. All which we wish is to have it made certain by authority that we should not, in case of re-union, be obliged to hold them ourselves."

Catholic mind.* These are in number twenty-two; and we imagine that Dr. Pusey will himself consider them the most effective in his catalogue. We will consider each one of these without exception :—

1. S. Alphonsus says: "Those whom the justice of God saves not, the infinite mercy of Mary saves by her intercession." Dr. Pusey (p. 103) puts the word "infinite" into italics, as showing the point of his objection. But can he seriously mean that S. Alphonsus lays down, as a dogmatic proposition, the infinitude of Mary's attributes? "I have taken infinite trouble

* [The reference here is to Cardinal Newman's "Letter," pp. 458–461. In April, 1866, I had ventured to say that I "regret his language" in these pages. "Had he read in their context"—I added—"the passages cited by Dr. Pusey from St. Alphonsus; from the Ven. Grignon de Montfort; and from Salazar's two easily accessible works; he would have been able to defend those illustrious writers against Dr. Pusey's most unfounded calumny."

On various subsequent occasions however, the "Dublin Review" had to vindicate Cardinal Newman's language against most serious misapprehension. Several persons, who read his work hastily, fancied that he had expressed agreement with Dr. Pusey in *censuring* the above-mentioned passages. But his declarations are most express in the opposite sense. "The writers," he says, "doubtless did not use" the phrases on which Dr. Pusey laid stress "as any Protestant would naturally take them." "I do not speak of the statements as they are found in their authors." "I cannot believe that they mean what you [Dr. Pusey] say." "I am looking at them. not as spoken *by the tongues of angels*, but according to that literal sense which they bear in the mouths of English men and English women"; "as spoken by man to man in England in the nineteenth century." According to Cardinal Newman then, the inculpated passages were uttered indeed by the very "tongues of angels"; but were quite sure to be grossly misunderstood, when placed crudely before Englishmen of the nineteenth century.]

to oblige you," says a friend to Dr. Pusey. "Sir," gravely replies the latter, "you shock me: no one can do anything infinite, save God Alone." S. Alphonsus meant of course, that our Lady's mercy embraces every kind of evil, moral or spiritual, which can possibly be brought before her in prayer.

2. S. Alphonsus also says (p. 103), "God has resigned into her hands (*if one might say so*) His Omnipotence in the sphere of grace." The very words which we have italicised show that he is not speaking literally; and the general thought has been already explained by us.

3. The vision of the two ladders, already treated. (See pp. 67, 68.)

4, 5. Bernardine of Bustis says that "the Blessed Virgin is Superior to God, ... in respect of the manhood which He assumed from her"; and S. Bernardine of Sienna that "He is subject to Her command" (p. 103). This we have already explained in pp. 73–77.

6, 7. That most admirable man, M. Olier, expressed himself in the following strange way:—

"We are very unworthy to draw near unto Jesus; and He has a right to repulse [rebuter] us, because of His justice: since, *having entered into all the feelings of His Father from the time of His blessed Resurrection, He finds himself in the same disposition with the Father toward sinners, i.e., to reject them; so that the difficulty is to induce Him* to exchange the office of Judge for that of Advocate; and of a Judge, to make Him a suppliant. Now this is what the Saints effect, and especially the most Blessed Virgin" (p. 104).

Now if M. Olier intended this dogmatically, he undoubtedly uttered two heresies: yet most strangely, while Dr. Pusey is extremely sensitive to the milder of the two, he shows himself profoundly unconscious of that which is far more grievous. It is undoubtedly heretical to think Mary's love of sinners greater than Christ's; but it is a far more grievous heresy to hold, that the love, felt for them by the Infinite God, is less than that felt for them by the Sacred Humanity. As regards however the former heresy, which is the topic of Dr. Pusey's indictment, Mr. Rhodes, in one of his letters ("Weekly Register," March 3), points out that in the very preceding page M. Olier "proclaims, with an unusual sweetness and tenderness, the more usual doctrine" on our Lord's most tender sympathy with sinners. We conclude therefore, that if M. Olier intended dogmatically the words above quoted, he wrote them under some temporary absence or obscuration of mind. But we cannot help regarding it as far more probable, that he did not intend them dogmatically at all; but merely as a practical exhortation to sinners, that they should approach Mary as their special advocate and mediatrix when they have offended her Son.

8. S. Alphonsus adopts the statement (p. 106) that our Lady "is the only refuge of those who have incurred the Divine indignation." This we have explained in p. 66.

9. Dr. Pusey was far oftener asked by Catholics to pray for his conversion to our Lady than to her Son.

He has been understood* to infer from this that, in the opinion of such Catholics, "Mary alone can obtain a Protestant's conversion"; but surely no such inference is ever so remotely deducible from the fact he mentions. As to that fact, we have already considered it in pp. 50, 51.

10. We now enter on four extracts from Salazar. It must be remembered that his works have never been specially examined at Rome, as have been those of S. Alphonsus and of Montfort; nor again have the opinions cited from him any wide currency among Catholics, as have e.g. those from S. Alphonsus. There would be no difficulty whatever therefore in any Catholic abandoning, as theologically erroneous and incapable of defence, whatever might be so judged by him in these respective extracts. Yet we should be extremely surprised if any well-instructed Catholic were disposed to do so, who read them in the context; and to us certainly they appear not only in no respect unsound, but edifying and beautiful. Firstly, then, he says—

"It may be questioned whether, if, per impossibile, there had been no Will of the Father, and His Mother alone wished and decreed that her Son should die for men, this would suffice that Christ, obeying his Mother, should willingly undergo death. I believe that Christ so deferred to His Mother, that it would have sufficed. *Let others think as they will.* I add that the Mother of God herself embraces the human race with so much love and affection that if, according to the aforesaid

* [By Cardinal Newman.]

supposition, that Will of the Eternal Father were wanting, she would yet, of her own will, choose that her Son should die for men" (pp. 158-9).

We can see nothing in this extract requiring explanation; our only wonder is, that any one should stumble at it. It has been thought indeed * that Protestants might not unreasonably understand the passage as meaning, "that *it would have sufficed for the salvation of men* if our Lord had died, not to obey His Father, but to defer to the decree of His Mother"; and such a tenet would of course be heretical. But we cannot for the life of us see in Salazar's passage even the remotest hint of such a tenet.

"11. As He was the Son of God by nature, so, they say, was she 'by a more noble right than that of adoption only, a right which emulates in a manner natural filiation'" (p. 161).

Those who read this sentence of Dr. Pusey's will hardly be prepared for the fact that, in close context with the words cited, Salazar says expressly, "Mary is the daughter of God by adoption, and not by nature." He proceeds however to urge, that in a certain sense she was the spouse of Christ; and that therefore—apart altogether from her *adopted* filiation,—she was in a certain sense, not indeed God's *daughter*, but His *daughter-in-law*. We can readily understand the opinion that this is a trivial fancy; but when Dr. Pusey raises it into a serious ground of complaint, one's only legitimate inference is that he must be very hard pressed for evidence to his indictment.

* [By Cardinal Newman.]

12. On the next head we will insert a somewhat more extended extract than Dr. Pusey has given. It occurs in an exposition of the trite text, Prov. viii. 22.

"S. Ambrose, by the word 'viarum' understands 'virtues': and affirms that Christ was created by the Father as a beginning of God's paths, because (says he) to Him was assigned *the first exhibition of all great virtues;* in such sense namely, that those Evangelical virtues, which had been unknown in previous ages, *were disclosed by Him as so many new paths:* I mean humility, virginity, poverty, and the like. Yet I know not whether Mary may not be more truly called the beginning of these paths or virtues than Christ. *I am speaking of the beginning of execution,* and that *by way of anticipation,* not *in the sense of cause.* Because the Virgin exercised in act those most excellent Evangelical virtues, before Christ came and taught them by word and example. . . . . And truly it was suitable* that the Mother should be strong in those virtues which the Son was afterwards to exercise; that He might be said 'matrizare,' i.e., to reproduce His Mother's character (matris suæ mores referre). And thus it was requisite (oportebat) that the Virgin's virtues should be such, that the Son in imitating (imitans) them should fulfil the office of Saviour."

Now our Lord "fulfilled the office of Saviour," as in other ways, so also in leading a life of spotless sanctity; and it is of course to this particular that reference is here made. Salazar says that He led a spotless life in imitating His Mother's virtues. Now undoubtedly if it were meant by this that, except for her example,

* "Ita decuit." Dr. Pusey strangely translates this "*must* needs be" (p. 161).

He would not have known wherein true virtue consists, —not a word could be said in extenuation of a sentiment so intolerable, revolting, and heretical. But a critic must be absolutely blind with prejudice, who can ascribe to the words any such sense. Salazar is pursuing his favourite theme — the praises of the Deipara; and he gives one special reason of congruity, why it was suitable that she should be so bright and spotless a specimen of virtue. His argument may be thus expressed: "It is a great perfection in a son as such if, without thereby being at all the less excellent, he is a true image both of father and mother. Why should we deny this perfection to Christ? I affirm therefore, that He was a true image both of Father and Mother; that she exhibited the very same virtues which were conspicuous in Him. He led a faultless life then (Virginis virtutes imitans) in doing those very good acts which He saw His Mother do."

"13. As I have often inculcated, Christ so wrought our Redemption, as to call in Mary as an aid in this work. Wherefore as the birth, nature itself guiding, derives strength from the man, but, from the woman, form and beauty; so also our Redemption (which was produced, as it were, through Mary and Christ*) derives from Christ sufficiency, strength and consistency, but from Mary beauty and loveliness. For as therefrom that Christ the Lord worked our Redemption, we infer rightly that nothing of sufficiency or might was wanting to it; so therefrom that the Virgin co-

* "Parta per Mariam et Christum." Dr. Pusey most inaccurately translates this "*borne by* Mary and Christ" (p. 162, note.)

operated to the same, we rightly deduce that nothing of form or beauty was missed in it. For in some way the grace and beauty of the Redemption would fade, if the aforesaid co-operation of the Virgin were lacking."—(Salaz. pro Immac. Virg. Conc., § 14, n. 171.)

Almost immediately after this, Salazar proceeds to say that the Blessed Virgin was "the first and the pattern (previa) *among all the redeemed*": words which render his meaning absolutely unmistakable, and which we think Dr. Pusey would have done better to quote. As to the passage which he does quote,—we think it extremely beautiful, but that is a matter of opinion; as to its theological soundness, we cannot make any defence where we are absolutely unable to imagine the ground of attack.

14. From Salazar we now proceed to the Ven. Grignon de Montfort; all whose works, be it remembered, have been carefully examined at Rome, and pronounced to contain nothing contrary to faith or morals, or to the Church's common sentiment and practice. On opening him, we find at once a much deeper and more solid vein of thought than in Salazar. He seems to have no leisure (as it were) for those beautiful fancies which delight the Jesuit scholastic; because his whole attention is earnestly concentrated on the great work of man's sanctification and salvation. Nor are we at all surprised at F. Faber's testimony (Preface, page i.), "that those who take him for their master will hardly be able to name a saint or ascetical writer to whose grace and spirit

their mind will be more subject than to his." Further on F. Faber adds—

"There is a growing feeling of something inspired and supernatural about it, as we go on studying it; and with that we cannot help experiencing, after repeated readings of it, that its novelty never seems to wear off, nor its fulness to be diminished, nor the fresh fragrance and sensible fire of its unction ever to abate."

And here, before considering in order those various propositions of his which we are specially to treat, we will give one or two other extracts; as illustrating the relative position which he respectively ascribes to our Lord and His Blessed Mother.

"I avow, with all the Church, that Mary, being but a mere creature that has come from the hands of the Most High, is, in comparison with His Infinite Majesty, less than an atom; or rather she is nothing at all: because He only is 'He who is'; and thus by consequence that grand Lord, always independent and sufficient to Himself, never had, and has not now, any absolute need of the Holy Virgin for the accomplishment of His Will and for the manifestation of His Glory" (p. 7).

"The predestinate will know what is the most sure, the most easy, the most short, and the most perfect means by which to *go to Jesus Christ;* and they will deliver themselves to Mary, body and soul, without reserve, *that they may thus be all for Jesus Christ*" (p. 34).

"Jesus Christ our Saviour, true God and true Man, ought to be the last end of all our other devotions, *else they are false and delusive.* Jesus Christ is the alpha and omega, the beginning and the end of all things.

We labour not, as the Apostle says, except to render every man *perfect in Jesus Christ;* because it is in Him alone that the whole plenitude of the Divinity dwells, together with all the other plenitudes of graces, virtues, and perfections; because it is in Him alone that we have been blessed with all spiritual benediction; and because He is our only Master, who has to teach us; our only Lord, on whom we ought to depend; our only Head, to whom we must belong; our only Model, to whom we should conform ourselves; *our only Physician, who can heal us; our only Shepherd, who can feed us; our only Way, who can lead us; our only Truth, who can make us grow; our only Life, who can animate us; and our only All in all things, who can suffice us.* There has been no other name given under heaven, except the name of Jesus, *by which we can be saved.* God has laid no other foundation of our salvation, of our perfection, and of our glory, except Jesus Christ. *Every building which is not built upon that firm rock is founded upon the moving sand, and sooner or later will fall infallibly.* Every one of the faithful who is not united to Him, as a branch to the stock of the vine, shall fall, shall wither, and shall be fit only to cast into the fire. If we are in Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ in us, we have no condemnation to fear. Neither the angels of heaven, nor the men of earth, nor the devils of hell, nor any other creatures can injure us; because they cannot separate us from the love of God which is in Jesus Christ. By Jesus Christ, with Jesus Christ, in Jesus Christ, we can do all things; we can render all honour and glory to the Father in the unity of the Holy Ghost; we can become perfect ourselves, and be to our neighbour a good odour of eternal life.

If then we establish the solid devotion to our Blessed Lady, it is only to establish more perfectly the devotion to Jesus Christ, and to put forward an easy and secure means for finding Jesus Christ. *If devotion to our Lady*

removed us from Jesus Christ, we should have to reject it as an illusion of the devil; but on the contrary, so far from this being the case, there is nothing which makes devotion to our Lady more necessary for us, as I have already shown, and will show still further hereafter, than that *it is the means of finding Jesus Christ perfectly, of loving Him tenderly, and of serving Him faithfully*" (pp. 37–9).

We think it most unfair in Dr. Pusey—though we by no means impute to him intentional unfairness—that he has been wholly silent on these most express testimonies. And now for those which he does cite.

God "recognizes" in Mary's clients "the merits of His Son and of his Holy Mother" (p. 143). So, as has been seen, in an indulgenced prayer Catholics appeal to "the merits of Jesus and Mary." But Dr. Pusey changes this elementary statement into the proposition (p. 163) that, "*as* we are clothed with the merits of Christ, *so* also with the merits of Mary"; from which his readers would infer Montfort to have said, that Catholics are clothed with the merits of Mary, *in the same sense* in which they are clothed with those of Christ. It cannot be necessary to explain for the benefit of any Catholic—it is strange it should be necessary for Dr. Pusey's—that, in Montfort's view as in that of any other Catholic, Christ's merits avail to us in the way of condignity, Mary's only in the way of congruity; nay, and that Mary's own merits rest upon her Son's as on their one sole condignly meritorious cause.

15, 16, 17. We are here interrupted for a moment

by three consecutive propositions, taken from a young ecclesiastic named Oswald, whose work was placed on the Index. He was no doubt animated by the best intentions; for when condemned "laudabiliter se subjecit."

All the remaining propositions are from Montfort.

18. He mentions (p. 125) "souls which are not born of blood, nor of flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God and Mary"; in other words, who savour not of flesh, and blood, and human corruption, but of God and Mary. We are quite unable to understand Dr. Pusey's difficulty, in this most suggestive expression. But, as he refers vaguely in a note to p. 74 as imbuing the phrase with special poison, we will gratify our pious readers by extracting the page.

"Oh! but my labour will have been well expended if this little writing, falling into the hands of a soul of good dispositions, a soul well born,—born of God and of Mary, and not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man,—should unfold to him, and should, by the grace of the Holy Ghost inspire him with, the excellence and the price of that true and solid devotion to our Blessed Lady, which I am going presently to describe. If I knew that my guilty blood could serve in engraving upon any one's heart the truths which I am writing in honour of my true Mother and Sovereign Mistress, I would use my blood instead of ink to form the letters, in the hope to find some good souls who, by their fidelity to the practice which I teach, shall compensate to my dear Mother and Mistress for the losses which she has suffered through my ingratitude and infidelities. I feel myself more than ever animated to believe and to hope all

which I have had deeply engraven upon my heart, and have asked of God these many years: namely, that sooner or later the Blessed Virgin shall have more children, servants, and slaves of love than ever; *and that by this means Jesus Christ, my dear Master, shall reign more in hearts than ever*" (pp. 73–4).

19. The concluding extracts occur in an analogy, which to some may seem far-fetched, but which to us appears singularly beautiful: an analogy between that joint office on the one hand, whereby the Holy Ghost and Mary produced Christ Himself,—and that joint office on the other hand, whereby they form Christ in the individual soul. The paragraphs are not very distinctly expressed; but there can be no doubt as to the general doctrine which they contain. Certain souls permit Mary to "strike her roots" in them; i.e. to produce in them, by her watchful vigilance and unremitting intercession, a real though imperfect image of herself. When the Holy Ghost sees that Mary *has* thus taken root,—or (to use the author's expression) when he sees Mary in those souls,—He flies to them, and, in conjunction with Mary, performs the "startling wonder" (p. 20) of forming Christ within them. In other words, sanctity in its germ is specially attributed by the author to Mary's intercession. In its maturity however, it is described as the formation of Jesus Christ in the soul, through the joint agency of the Holy Ghost and Mary. She watchfully intercedes; He puts forth His highest efficacy in training and nurturing the soul; and so

the complete image of her Son is more and more effectually produced within it.

We should further add, what is a first principle in theology, that the Holy Ghost differs from the other Divine Persons, in that he has no *Divine* Fecundity. The Father generates the Son; the Father and Son, by one undivided spiration, produce the Holy Ghost; but He produces no Divine Person. It is only therefore in acting on created things, that His Fecundity exists. And now our readers will be able to understand the whole extract, as cited from Dr. Pusey's pages. "The Holy Ghost brings into fruitfulness His action by her; producing in her and by her Jesus Christ in His members."

"20. Mary is the Queen of heaven and earth by grace, as Jesus is the King of them by nature and by conquest.. Now, as the kingdom of Jesus Christ consists principally in the heart and interior of a man—according to that word, 'The kingdom of God is within you,'—in like manner the kingdom of our Blessed Lady is principally in the interior of a man, that is to say, his soul; and it is in souls that she is more glorified with her Son than in all visible creatures, and that we can call her, as the Saints do, the Queen of hearts."

We are unable to conjecture the objection to these words, and so we pass on.

21, 22. "She and the Holy Ghost produce in the soul extraordinary things; and, when the Holy Ghost finds Mary in a soul, He flies there." These beautiful statements have now been fully elucidated.

And this is all, which Dr. Pusey's extensive learning

and intense hatred of the Catholic devotion to the Most Holy Virgin have enabled him to bring forward! So far as our own personal feeling is concerned, we can but thank him for the delight he has given us, in making or renewing acquaintance with thoughts so elevating and heavenly.

We explained at starting that we hope in our next number to answer the objection to this devotion, which is founded on the alleged silence or contradiction of Scripture and Antiquity. The particular objection however, to which we have now replied, both *does* and (as we think) *should* influence Protestants far more profoundly than the other; and we trust our readers may think that we have steadily confronted it. This objection alleges that the Church, by her encouragement of such devotion, obscures the thought of God, and fosters in her children a certain approach to idolatry. We fully agree with Canon Oakeley (pp. 40–41), "that this great crux of Dr. Pusey's is a phantom of the devil's creating, and one among the many evidences which history and experience furnish of his implacable hostility to her whom he knows to be the great antagonist of his power." In regard to those doctrines concerning our Blessed Lady which the Church inculcates magisterially on all her children, we have maintained that every Christian, who accepts and acts on them, will find them invaluable helps to unworldliness and true spirituality. In regard to those further propositions, which have been advocated by holy men with the Church's full permission, we have pursued a middle

course. We have pointed out on the one hand, that though no Catholic may censure them, he is not required in any way to believe or even to think about them; and that many practices, most beneficial to one man, may be injurious to another. But we have given it as our own humble opinion on the other hand, that those whom the Holy Ghost draws to accept and contemplate these propositions, have received from Him a high and special privilege; because such contemplation affords a singular and inappreciable help towards acquiring unworldliness of spirit, and growing in energetic and tender love for God and for Christ.

But however this particular point be decided, we would allege it as certain, that hearty, constant, pervasive devotion to the Blessed Virgin is a habit which conduces with quite exceptional power to growth in mortification of heart and in unworldliness. The mind has a most real capacity for apprehension and love of the Infinite: but however intensely that capacity be exercised, there still remains a very large residue of affection for finite objects. Now it is the Church's end, that her children's hearts be anchored in the invisible world; that they measure all earthly things by a heavenly standard. This great end then is most inadequately promoted, unless their love for the finite, as well as for the Infinite, find great scope in their religious exercises. And more particularly it is of inestimable value, that that unspeakably tender and powerful feeling—a child's love towards its mother—be allowed a hearty vent on such a being as Mary. Lastly, their love of finite heavenly persons reacts

most powerfully on, and indefinitely intensifies, their love of God; and gives to that love an otherwise untasted quality of tenderness and passionate devotion. There is no adequate protection therefore against that miserable snare of worldliness, which in these days is so formidable and so subtle a danger, except hearty and unintermitting devotion to Blessed Mary and all Saints; for otherwise that love of finite objects, which cannot possibly be eradicated, will find its exclusive gratification in this visible world. Nor is this a mere ingenious fancy devised for the occasion: on the contrary, it is a theory visibly borne out by facts. One must not indeed judge individuals, but classes; for individuals are not unfrequently, from misapprehension, better or worse than their speculative opinions. Let us look then at classes. Since the Reformation there has always been a number of Catholics, who have been on principle reserved and sparing in their devotion to our Blessed Lady. God forbid we should deny that among these some are to be found, who are models of every Christian virtue, and whose disparagement of such devotion is entirely founded on misconception of its true tendency. But (as we said) we are considering those Catholics as a *class*. And we certainly think that in them, as in the more earnest and zealous of Protestants, no fact is more generally conspicuous, than the union of a real desire to obey and please God with a certain strange and perverse worldliness of judgment. Take nationalism; or naturalism; or intellectualism; or respect for worldly greatness; or any other of the prevailing

antichrists. It has its chief supporters, of course, among men altogether indevout and irreligious; but who are those more pious persons, who shrink from meeting it with the unquailing resistance and the frank defiance which are its due? They will commonly, we believe, be found among those, who are scant and sparing in their language on the worship due to Mary Most Holy, to Angels, and to Saints. Dr. Pusey observes (p. 181) that "that portion of the Roman Church which is most devoted to the cultus of the Blessed Virgin, is most persuaded of the personal infallibility of the Pope." This is no accidental coincidence; it is the same phenomenon, which always has been and always will be presented. Those are the very same habits of thought, under which on the one hand a man shrinks from the tender, unintermitting, eager worship of Mary; and under which on the other hand he is cold and disloyal to the Vicar of Christ. She is the especial foe to worldliness in heaven, and he is its especial foe on earth.*

[The preceding article was criticised at the time by one or two adverse writers. Their especial assault was against what may be called its one fundamental

* [This last paragraph is taken from a later article of mine.]

and central argument on the defensive side. I refer to the parallel which in several places I drew out, between those objections which the Protestant is so fond of adducing against the worship of Mary, and those which a Unitarian might allege against the worship of Jesus Christ. Surely, said those writers, there is the most palpable and ineffaceable distinction possible, between praying to Him whom we believe to be God, and praying to her whom we admit not to be God. On several occasions I replied in one shape or another to this reply; and I will here set forth the substance of what I urged.

Firstly then, there is doubtless a most broad and generic difference, between worshipping Jesus Christ as God and worshipping His Mother as a creature. But surely the difference is no less broad and generic, between a Trinitarian's worship of the Sacred Humanity, and a Unitarian's worship of the Invisible God.

But secondly the question whether this be so or not, is in fact entirely irrelevant to my argument. That argument was as follows. A Protestant objects to the devotion towards Mary prevalent among Catholics, on this ground. "Love of God," he says, "and "of Jesus is the highest of spiritual perfections. But "the constant thought of Mary is greatly prejudicial "to this love, by drawing men's minds from the "Creator to the creature. And a proof of this is, "that when a pious Roman Catholic is in trouble, he "far more spontaneously turns to Mary than to her "Son." The fact here is enormously over-stated, as I hope I have shown in the preceding article. Still,

merely for argument's sake, I am content to admit it. But I have pointed out in my article, that a Unitarian may allege an objection most strikingly analogous to this against the worship of Jesus Christ.

Thus. "Love of God, for the sake of His Divine "Excellences, is the highest of spiritual perfections. "But the constant thought of Christ is greatly pre- "judicial to this perfection, as leading man to love "God, not for the sake of His necessary *Divine* Ex- "cellences, but rather for the sake of those *human* "excellences which (according to Trinitarian doctrine) "He has freely assumed. And a proof of this is, that "a pious Trinitarian, when in trouble, very far more "spontaneously turns to Jesus Christ than to the "Invisible God. If it were for the *Divine* Excellences "that he loved Christ, his habit would of course be "precisely the reverse. Trinitarians then must "admit—if they will look facts in the face—*either* "that they love the created nature far more than "they love the Uncreated Person, *or* that they love "the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity far more "than they love the First."

Now of course every Trinitarian, who has practised the worship of Jesus, knows experimentally that there lurks somewhere or other some monstrous fallacy in the Unitarian's argument. But then in like manner every Catholic, who has practised devotion to our Blessed Lady, knows experimentally that there lurks somewhere or other some monstrous fallacy in the *Protestant's* argument. And the Protestant theologian is surely called on to explain, *wherein* precisely lies

the Unitarian's fallacy. In the preceding article I have set forth, as best I could, what seems to me the true and irrefragable answer to the Unitarian's objections. And I have further maintained, that a reply of the same kind, and one at least equally irrefragable, can be made to those objections, which are adduced by the Protestant against the Catholic's devotion to Mary most holy. How far I have succeeded in this, it is for others to judge. But my argument is surely, beyond all possible question, relevant and to the purpose.]

FRAGMENTS ON DEVOTION TO OUR BLESSED LADY.

I.

The Second Eve, or the Mother of Life. By V. Dechamps, Bishop of Namur.* Authorized Translation. London: Burns & Co.

[July 1866.]

PERHAPS English Catholics are indebted for this volume to the Eirenicon. We know the case of one person many years ago, then on her way to the Church, who was goaded (as it were) into saying her first "Hail Mary," by way of reparation for the shocking insults on our Lady which she heard uttered by a Protestant bishop. In like manner we believe that there are several persons who have been driven, by Dr. Pusey's irreverence, to study S. Alphonsus and Montfort with far greater zest and far more hearty appreciation than ever before. It must not of course be forgotten, that Mgr. Dechamps is one of S. Alphonsus's spiritual children, and therefore an enthusiast in his defence. Still, after reading Dr. Pusey, it is almost diverting to find the "Glories of Mary" thus spoken of. "This is my spiritual thermometer," said a friend to the author: "when I am careless and lukewarm, the treatise no longer suits me; but when

* [I need hardly remind my readers that Mgr. Dechamps is now Archbishop of Malines.]

the eye of my soul is restored to its strength and purity, it finds itself in union with this precious book" (p. xii.). The author indeed does not agree with this opinion; but his disagreement arises from his thinking such praise too little. "Experience proves daily that the 'Glories of Mary' touches sinners and brings them back to God," no less truly than it edifies those who are interior and saintly.

Mgr. Dechamps's own work, however, is on a different plan from the "Glories of Mary," being far more doctrinal and systematic. A careful dogmatic foundation is laid down for the whole devotional superstructure; and we fancy that several readers may find the present volume most interesting and satisfactory, who are not personally so very much drawn to the "Glories of Mary." In fact the Bishop of Namur has made every chapter a brief dogmatic essay, closed by a suitable prayer.

We need hardly mention — the Bishop being a Redemptorist—that his devotion appertains throughout to that "extreme" or Alphonsine type, with which we are ourselves far more in sympathy than with any other. He quotes Gregory XVI. as pronouncing, that S. Alphonsus himself "shines among the greatest luminaries of the Church" (p. 89). "How blind do those appear, O Lord, who fear to say too much of Thy Mother!" (p. 27). "The more faithfully we follow the Divine order by constantly approaching Him by the blessed medium of His Mother, the more shall we find our prayers increase in the confidence which renders them efficacious. . . . . Do we go

less directly to God by going in company with His Mother?" (p. 96). "Let us venerate Mary with all the powers of our soul and all the affections of our heart" (p. 98). "There is nothing which we may not hope from a heart which is faithful to this devotion —a heart which does not lose hold of that merciful chain by which God has bound the hearts of His prodigal children in all ages to Himself. No wonder, then, that theologians give devotion to Mary as one of the most certain signs of predestination" (p. 192). S. Stanislaus Kotska "never began any action without first turning to an image of Mary to ask her blessing" (p. 198). "The Son, Omnipotent by nature, has made His Mother omnipotent by grace" (p. 204). And the calm scientific tone, in which the volume is written, adds threefold force to such expressions.

The translation is beautifully executed; and we have to express our heartfelt gratitude for the boon bestowed by it on English Catholics.

II.

Cardinal Wiseman and Bishop Challoner. By Rev. A. B. London: Richardson.

[July 1866.]

Mr. A. B. writes in a most genial and kindly spirit, and has a good word for every one. Nor can anything be more excellent than the purpose of his pamphlet. He thinks that many Anglicans are now fully prepared to become Catholics, were they not deterred by their

alarm of "Mariolatry"; and he wishes to show them that their alarm is groundless.

But, although we cannot but profoundly respect both Mr. A. B.'s character and his intentions, we are obliged, nevertheless, to think the means adopted by him hardly appropriate to his end. He aims, of course, at influencing—not violent fanatics—but pious, intelligent, and candid Anglicans: yet the truths on which he lays stress are such, that no men of this kind ever doubted them. He points out that S. Alphonsus's extreme expressions, "however misintelligible by English separatists, bear a truly Christian and devout sense"; and he also explains that, according to the belief of every Catholic, our Lady can no otherwise benefit us than by her prayers. But surely it is only the more violent and prejudiced of Protestants, who have any *doubt* on these two facts; and the stumbling-block of candid and intelligent Anglicans is something quite different. They would probably have no great objection to our addressing the most Blessed Virgin from time to time, with a view to obtaining her prayers. What alarms them, is the prominent position held by her in the mind of devout Catholics; the extremely important place assigned to her worship in the whole interior life; the constant and (as it were) indissoluble union between the thought of her and of her Son. For instance, prayers indulgenced by successive Popes use such expressions as these:—"I give thee [Mary] all myself"; "I consecrate myself to thee without reserve"; "O Joseph, obtain for us that we may be entirely devoted to the

service of Jesus and Mary." As Dr. Pusey has urged again and again, all this is quite different *in kind* from a mere practice of occasionally asking her to intercede for us; and we do not see that Mr. A. B. has said one word to remove this difficulty.

The real question for a Catholic's consideration is surely this:—Does the Church, or does she not, counsel the habitual, constant, earnest thought and remembrance of the Most Holy Virgin? Is such thought and remembrance, or is it not, an invaluable means of grace? Does it, or does it not, give extraordinary help in acquiring a true love for her Son? If it does not, then surely—considering the frightful prejudice excited in the non-Catholic mind by the devotions to Mary which Catholics practise—it is the dictate of charity greatly to curtail and pare down at at least the public exhibition of those devotions; to cease from observing the Month of Mary; to exhibit her images far less conspicuously in our churches; &c., &c. And this, as we shall immediately see, is Mr. A. B.'s own practical conclusion. But if, on the contrary, the preceding question should be answered in the affirmative, then a Catholic will regard Anglican objections to his worship of Mary, just as he regards Unitarian objections to his worship of Jesus.

Mr. A. B., we say, does not explicitly treat the preceding question at all; but implicitly he answers it in the negative. "Let us not needlessly add," he says, "to the unreasoning fears of our Protestant fellow-countrymen; let us, in all uncommanded forms of worship or devotion in public, *charitably refrain from*

much that, *not being necessary for ourselves*, might tend to detain our neighbours in a mere fragmentary Christianity" (p. 13). He cannot of course mean that, for the sake of not shocking Protestants, we should abstain from pressing forward a devotion, eminently conducive to the love of God and of Christ; and he must hold therefore, that habitual and constant devotion to our Blessed Lady is *not* thus conducive. We are not here arguing against this opinion: we are only pointing out that such is the real question at issue, and that Mr. A. B. nowhere confronts it.

We will make one final observation. Let us here assume, that the true answer to this question is contradictory to that implied by Mr. A. B.; and let us suppose accordingly, that a number of interior and fervent souls do fix their thoughts constantly on Mary. Their devout meditations will indefinitely differ from each other, according to the circumstances of personal or national character; of education; of intellectual power; of accidental habit; and the like: but in one point, rely on it, they will agree; viz., in being unspeakably startling and repulsive to an ordinary Anglican. It is not the *particular shape* into which S. Alphonsus and Montfort have thrown their reflections, that repels such men as Dr. Pusey; for no two shapes can be more extremely different. It is not because they are foreigners and he an Englishman, that he finds their devotions so absolutely intolerable. It is because their thoughts in any shape are fixed so constantly, intently, reverently, on a creature.

Between him and devout worshippers of Mary lies a broad gulf of doctrinal separation; and we cannot think that Mr. A. B.'s pamphlet will give him any help for crossing it.

We have been the more full in noticing this short pamphlet, because we think that some such method of meeting Protestant objections finds favour with various excellently-intentioned Catholics; and because we are convinced that it must totally fail. It does not deserve success, because it is altogether fallacious; and it will not obtain success, because it is keenly felt by all Protestants to evade their real difficulty.

III.

Simple Explanations concerning the Co-operation of the Most Holy Virgin. By F. Pierre Jeanjacquot, S.J. London: Philp.

[January 1870.]

This is not an ascetical work, but rather the foundation for an indefinite *number* of ascetical works. It may be described as a dogmatic exposition of what is intended in those two epithets, "Co-redemptress," and "Mother of Christians," the ascription of which to our Blessed Lady has received such high sanction from the Church. Some persons use these epithets with no adequate sense of what they imply; while others on the contrary, supposing the former to mean more than it does mean, protest against its use. We venture to think that all educated Catholics will do

well to study this little work with the most serious attention, in order both that their devotion to our Blessed Lady be sufficiently pervasive and profound, and also that it may rest on an intelligent foundation. Dr. Pusey will, of course, see in it only one continued addition to the pure Gospel. But neither Dr. Pusey nor any one else will think of denying that, if those doctrines be really true which are here scientifically set forth, devotion to our Blessed Lady has the most intimate possible connection with a Christian's whole interior life. We should not ourselves hesitate to say, that the love of God and of our Blessed Lord receives altogether a new *quality*, when supported by the sustained and most tender worship of the Deipara.

The one obvious objection to the Catholic phrase, "Co-redemptress," is, that it denies the office of our Lord as Sole Redeemer. This difficulty arises (p. 10) from men forgetting that there are two different kinds of co-operation; and (p. 11) that where the co-operation takes place "by counsel, by instigation, by intercession, or by *a consent without which the work could not be accomplished*," the work still remains *exclusively* performed by its immediate agent. So (p. 7) it was Adam's sin which *exclusively* wrought man's fall; and yet Eve actively co-operated in that fall, because she incited Adam to do that which exclusively caused it. Moreover (p.12) Eve's co-operation was formal and not merely material, because she knew she was exciting him to what involved man's ruin. In a parallel manner (p. 13), Christ Alone wrought man's whole redemption; and yet Mary as truly and as formally

co-operated in man's Redemption, as Eve in man's fall.

She co-operated of course in one sense, by the circumstance of becoming His Mother. But, if this were all, it could not be said (p. 16) that she is the co-operatrix of *Redemption*, except in a purely material sense. Much more than this therefore is true. At the solemn moment of the Annunciation, man's Redemption depended on the alternative, whether she would or would not give her consent. And the consent which she gave was not merely to the being Mother of God—that (p. 22) would have been simply an unparalleled exaltation and dignity—but she consented to His work of *Redemption;* she consented to undergo all that unspeakable suffering and anguish, which were involved in her Son dying for the sins of the world. As Eve then *formally* co-operated in the fall, so Mary *formally* co-operated in the Redemption.

When it is said, however, that Redemption depended on Mary's consent, it must not be forgotten (p. 20) that this involved no "jeopardizing of God's work": because by His infallible grace He secured her consent, without in any way violating her perfect liberty of will.

F. Jeanjacquot gives a most special significance to this consent of our Blessed Lady, by maintaining (p. 123), "with all confidence," that at that very moment and ever afterwards she had "a clear and distinct knowledge of each" redeemed soul. We merely mention this opinion, without presuming to criticise it. We heartily agree with him, that such a supposition

by no means "raises her beyond the rank of a pure creature" (p. 124); but we confess we should have been glad to see more direct evidence for a doctrine, most touching indeed and beautiful, but not commonly received. The quotations in p. 127 do not necessarily refer to her state *in viâ*. And the only other authority which we can find alleged, is an anonymous "pious author," cited in p. 87, who says, that at the time of the Passion, she "received by divine revelation a knowledge of the sins of each and all of the children of Adam." However, we heartily hope there *are* grounds for accepting a doctrine, so singularly engaging and attractive to piety.

On the other hand it must not be forgotten, that the Co-redemptress was herself redeemed; and the perfect harmony of these two facts is illustrated (p. 35) by a very striking parallel, between Eve's relation to Adam and Mary's to Jesus. Moreover, she was redeemed with a higher Redemption than any other creature; a Redemption (p. 36) of preservation and not of deliverance: for she was redeemed by her Son's foreseen death from all sin, original and actual; nay (as we heartily follow many theologians in holding) from the very debitum proximum of original sin. We are a little surprised that the author before us has not referred one way or another to this latter doctrine.

Nor is Mary only men's Co-redemptress; she is also their Mother. By this fact more is meant (p. 70) than that she bears to men the *affection* of a mother; she is literally my Mother, in a higher and truer sense even than my mother after the flesh can be so called.

"She had two child-bearings as it were: one of joy, in which she brought the Incarnate Word into the world; the other of unspeakable anguish, in which she brought us forth at the foot of the Cross (p. 75)." And who can tell the tenderness of her love for those whose Mother she has become through such bitter and transfixing dolours?

When Dr. Pusey then calls on the Church to moderate her children's devotion to the tenderest of mothers, he is calling on her to take from them one of their very highest spiritual privileges; one of the very highest and surest means which she places at their disposal (p. 49) for growing in the love of God and of Christ.

We have confined ourselves to a mere indication of what our readers will find in this invaluable little work, because we heartily hope they will procure it and study it carefully for themselves. And we may add that the Archbishop, in his most weighty preface, has admirably explained the especial value of such a work at the present time. These are his words:—

"There are certain minds which, professing to believe the Incarnation of God, refuse to call Mary, Mother of God; and first pervert and then declaim against the titles Co-redemptrix, Co-operatrix, Reparatrix, Mediatrix, and the like. The confidence and assumption with which the language and devotions, not only of simple Catholics but of the Saints, have been condemned by such writers, may well for a moment have alarmed some humble and timid minds. It is well, therefore, to place in their hands this excellent translation of a very solid, clear, and unanswerable proof

that our Blessed Mother, through the Incarnation of God, has received from her Divine Son a right to all her Titles. They are not metaphors, but truths; they express, not poetical or rhetorical ideas, but true and living relations between her and her Divine Son, and between her and us. Let us never shrink from calling her that which God has made her: let us never fear to seek her in those offices of grace with which God has invested her. May our Divine Lord preserve us from giving way a hair's breadth, before the face of anti-catholic censors, in the filial piety of our faith, or the childlike confidence of our devotion towards His Blessed Mother and our own. By such a cowardly and ungenerous bearing we should win no heart to love her, and we should gravely displease Him who loves and honours her every moment infinitely beyond all the love and honour that all creatures have ever paid or can pay to her."

IV.

Life and Select Writings of the Venerable Servant of God Louis Marie Grignon de Montfort. Translated from the French by a Secular Priest. London: Richardson.

[From an article in January 1871.]

The practice of devotion which Montfort suggests, and on which we shall here comment, is stated with especial clearness in a little work of his called "The Secret of Mary," contained in the above volume. We may suppose him to defend it by some such consideration as the following:—It is admitted, he may say, by all reasonable Theists, that men are more

perfect, — more adequately pursue the end of their existence—in proportion as they more simply conform themselves to God's Preference, in their various acts, words, and thoughts. The Christian adds to this statement, that help is given to them of inestimable value for the *achievement* of their great enterprise, the more habitually they unite the thought of God with the thought of Jesus Christ the God Incarnate. And in like manner the Catholic may further allege, that an invaluable additional assistance is afforded in the same direction, if the thought of Jesus is intimately connected with the thought of Mary His Mother.

So far we follow him unreservedly; the question to our mind turns entirely on his practical application of this principle. He recommends (p. 409), that "we *never* go to our Lord, except in Mary, through her intercession and power with Him; we must *never* be alone,"—i.e. as we understand him, without the explicit remembrance of Mary,—"when we pray to Him. Nor can there be," he beautifully adds, "any possibility of Mary obscuring the soul from God:" for "far from her detaining in herself the soul which casts itself upon her bosom, she on the contrary casts it immediately upon God, and unites it to Him with so much the more perfection as the soul is more united to her. Mary is the *marvellous echo of God*, who answers only 'God' when we say 'Mary'; who glorifies only God, when with S. Elizabeth we call her Blessed." And the kind of practical result which Montfort desires to secure, is perhaps nowhere more

clearly illustrated, than by the beautiful practice for Communion suggested in his larger and better known work. The following extract will explain what we mean:—

"After Holy Communion, while you are inwardly recollected and holding your eyes shut, you will introduce Jesus into the heart of Mary. You will give Him to his Mother, who will receive Him lovingly, will place Him honourably, will adore Him profoundly, will love Him perfectly, will embrace Him closely, and will render to Him, in spirit and in truth, many homages which are unknown to us in our thick darkness. Or else you will keep yourself profoundly humbled in your heart, in the presence of Jesus residing in Mary. Or you will sit like a slave at the gate of the king's palace, where he is speaking with the queen; and while they talk one to the other without need of you, you will go in spirit to heaven and over all the earth praying all creatures to thank, adore, and love Jesus and Mary in your place: 'Venite, adoremus, venite." Or else you shall yourself ask of Jesus, in union with Mary, the coming of His kingdom on earth, through His holy Mother; or you shall sue for the Divine wisdom, or for Divine love, or for the pardon of your sins, or for some other grace; but always *by* Mary and *in* Mary, saying, while you look aside at yourself, 'Ne respicias, Domine, peccata mea,'—'Lord, look not at my sins'; 'Sed oculi tui videant æquitates Mariæ,'—'But let your eyes look at nothing in me but the virtues and merits of Mary': and then, remembering your sins, you shall add, 'Inimicus homo hoc fecit,'—'It is I who have committed these sins'; or you shall say, 'Ab homine iniquo et doloso erue me"; or else, 'Te oportet crescere, me autem minui,'—'My Jesus, you must increase in my soul, and I must decrease; Mary,

you must increase within me, and I must be still less than I have been.' 'Crescite et multiplicamini,'— 'O Jesus and Mary, increase in me, and multiply yourselves outside in others also.'

"There are an infinity of other thoughts which the Holy Ghost furnishes, and will furnish you, if you are thoroughly interior, mortified, and faithful to this grand and sublime devotion which I have been teaching you. But always remember that the more you leave Mary to act in your Communion, the more Jesus will be glorified. The more you leave Mary to act for Jesus, and Jesus to act in Mary, the more profoundly you will humble yourself, and will listen to them in peace and silence, without putting yourself in trouble about seeing, tasting, or feeling: for the just man lives throughout on faith; and particularly in Holy Communion, which is an action of faith."— (Faber's translation, pp. 188–90.)

Now we heartily follow Montfort in holding, that never was there such a mere bugbear as the Protestant fear, lest the worship of Mary should keep God from shining into the whole heart. We further heartily follow him, in regarding it as an unspeakable blessing to the soul, that it should deeply feel its interior dependence, not on Jesus alone, but also on Mary. Again, due meditation on our Lord and on His Mother, on their mutual relations and their respective offices, will doubtless establish so close a connection between the two in a Catholic's mind, that the thought of one will be ever *implicitly* accompanied by thought of the other. But it is quite a further statement, that the union of the two Objects should be always *explicitly* maintained; and that it

would be generally advantageous never to address Jesus except through Mary. On this proposal—which we understand to be Montfort's—with profound diffidence and profound veneration for the holy writer, we would make the following remarks:—

1. He would himself of course admit, that there is a considerable number of men who have grown old in the practice of prayer on a different basis from his own; nor do we suppose for a moment that he would wish *them* to give a sudden and violent wrench to their religious habits. He can only mean, that those who are new in piety and have their devotional practices to form, or again who are dissatisfied with their existing usages, would derive great benefit from acting on his method.

2. Further he would, we suppose, also admit—certainly it is undeniable—that there is a large multitude possessing ordinary and (so to speak) commonplace vocations, whom no one would dream of inviting to such a practice.

3. On the other hand, neither (it would seem) can it admit of doubt, that there are *some* who derive vast spiritual benefit from Montfort's rule. He himself did so; and one sees no reason for accounting him singular in this respect.

4. The real question then seems to be this:—Can it be truly said that all, who are called to the heights of spiritual perfection, would be importantly assisted in their noble course, did they adopt the habit of never praying to Jesus except through Mary; nor meditating on the former except in relation with the

latter? Doubtless it is of immense benefit that such prayer and meditation should be very frequently practised; but the question is, whether every *other* kind of prayer and meditation towards our Lord should be avoided. Our own humble impression would be strongly on the negative side. There is no more marked characteristic of the Church's dealing with souls, than the inexhaustible variety of devotions, among which she would have individuals choose according to their several necessities and tastes.* And

* This is expressed by F. Newman with his customary beauty and felicity of language in his letter to Dr. Pusey :— "The faith is everywhere one and the same; but a large liberty is accorded to private judgment and inclination in matters of devotion. Any large church, with its collections and groups of people, will illustrate this. The fabric itself is dedicated to Almighty God, and that, under the invocation of the Blessed Virgin, or some particular Saint; or again, of some mystery belonging to the Divine Name or to the Incarnation, or of some mystery associated with the Blessed Virgin. Perhaps there are seven altars or more in it, and these again have their several Saints. Then there is the Feast proper to the particular day; and during the celebration of Mass, of all the worshippers who crowd around the Priest, each has his own particular devotions, with which he follows the rite. No one interferes with his neighbour; agreeing, as it were, to differ, they pursue independently a common end, and by paths, distinct but converging, present themselves before God. Then there are Confraternities attached to the church,—of the Sacred Heart, of the Precious Blood; associations of prayer for a good death, or the repose of departed souls, or the conversion of the heathen; devotions connected with the brown, blue, or red scapular;—not to speak of the great ordinary Ritual through the four seasons, the constant Presence of the Blessed Sacrament, its ever-recurring rite of Benediction, and its extraordinary forty hours' Exposition. Or, again, look through some such manual of prayers as the

we have difficulty in believing—unless there be much greater evidence than to our knowledge exists,—that holy men of every various temperament and character would all do well to take up so stringent a rule as the one in question. It may be an excellent rule for certain individuals; but we can see no reason for wishing it universally adopted. Speaking generally, if addresses to the Eternal Father are often most conducive to holiness though containing no mention of His Incarnate Son,—surely also many prayers to Jesus may be of invaluable benefit though they make no reference to His Mother. But we feel acutely that we have no right to speak on these exalted themes, except in the way of deferential suggestion and in the spirit of extreme diffidence.

At the same time, though we have difficulty in following Montfort as regards the universality of his recommendation, we are the very last to undervalue or disparage the books which contain it. The "Treatise on True Devotion," and the smaller work now first translated, abound in exquisitely beautiful and true thoughts, and are quite singularly calculated to promote the Catholic's love both to Mary and Her Son.

Raccolta, and you at once will see both the number and the variety of devotions, which are open to individual Catholics to choose from, according to their religious tastes and prospect of personal edification" (pp. 380, 381).

CATHOLIC DOCTRINES CONCERNING THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

PEACE THROUGH THE TRUTH.

An Eirenicon. By Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D. Oxford: Parker.

A Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., on his recent Eirenicon. By John Henry Newman, D.D., of the Oratory. London: Longman.

Peace through the Truth; or, Essays on Subjects connected with Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon. By Rev. T. Harper, S.J. London: Longman.

[October 1866.]

WE have said more than once that we expect great benefits from the Eirenicon, as in other ways, so particularly in eliciting Catholic treatises which would not otherwise have been written: yet we were hardly prepared for so powerful an illustration of our thought, as F. Harper's masterly volume. The other replies to Dr. Pusey, which have hitherto appeared, have been in the pamphlet form; and have rather therefore dealt with that divine's general principles, than grappled with his individual arguments and citations. The Bishop of Birmingham, Canon Oakeley, F. Gallwey, Mr. Allies, have done signal service in their various ways; and Mr. Allies indeed has written what is throughout one most closely reasoned and consecutive treatise: yet even as to him, the above remark substantially holds. As to F. Newman, we

would by no means imply that he has not done a work as signally beneficial to the Church as F. Harper, but still it is a work different in kind. His Scriptural and historical discussions—to which we shall often recur in this article—are most remarkable for their power and exhaustiveness; and the patristic testimonies, on which he has insisted, are in many different ways profoundly suggestive. His work exhibits that vast knowledge of the Fathers, and that singular power of combining, illustrating, and vivifying facts, in which the author is unrivalled. Still it is not so much occupied with encountering Dr. Pusey's arguments one by one, as with drawing out a general counter-view from ecclesiastical history. But F. Harper is not content with a clear and profound exposition of Catholic dogma; he grapples with his opponent step by step, and point by point. Dr. Pusey's misapprehensions indeed are in general so extreme, that it might seem no difficult task to expose them: yet we believe there are very few writers who would do this with that union of admirable temper, unruffled patience, exemplary candour, and controversial completeness, which distinguish F. Harper.

We hail this volume with peculiar pleasure, not only as a reply to the Eirenicon, but also on grounds altogether different. It is of extreme importance, we are firmly convinced, that educated laymen shall have access to some more profound knowledge of their religion, than can be derived from ordinary catechisms and books of devotion. We know well indeed, that various admirable persons, themselves carefully trained

in theology, conceive deep suspicions, as to a certain injurious effect which may be produced by the "half-knowledge" of theology. But we would submit with great respect to these excellent men, that half-knowledge is at all events—arithmetically speaking—just fifty times better than hundredth-part knowledge; and that this latter is the practical alternative. No layman e.g. can study such a volume as F. Harper's, without practically apprehending the fact that there *is* such a science—most real, profound, extensive, arduous,—as the theological; and without becoming at the same time practically aware (if the fact be so) that he is very ignorant of that science. Such a study will therefore dispose him to accept with due docility the unanimous dicta of theologians, and to approach the whole subject in the spirit of a learner. On the other hand, there are many laymen, who feel indeed the unapproachable importance of all matters connected with doctrine; but who have no other notion of what the latter is, than they have obtained from ordinary catechisms and from the light literature of the day. It is surely a task of no ordinary difficulty to preserve such men in that unreserved submission to ecclesiastical authority, which alone is reasonable under the circumstances; and which is so indispensably important, if very serious mischief is to be prevented. That several will be guided rightly along this narrow way by their Catholic instincts, by their pious practices, by their spirit of deference and humility, we thankfully admit; but there may be others, with whom the case will be different.

Here then is a volume directly and strictly theological, if ever there was such in the world; and it is addressed to the English reading public in general, whether Catholic or Protestant, whether ecclesiastical or lay. The writer expressly states (p. 291), that he is addressing inclusively "those to whom the subject-matter is comparatively new"; and (p. 339), "souls that are earnestly and honestly seeking after truth." The "Month" of last July again, in noticing his labours, expresses itself with much emphasis. "One of the great fruits to which we have been looking as likely to result from the publication of the Eirenicon, is the calm and positive statement of Catholic doctrine . . . on the part of trained and practised theologians, whose works might take their place *among the permanent treasures of our literature.*" We have the sanction then, both of F. Harper and of his Reviewer, for the opinion which we have expressed; and we must thank the former very heartily, for not only recognising the desideratum which exists, but for so importantly contributing towards its supply. The present instalment of what he has promised comprises three essays, besides an Introduction: (1) On the Unity of the Church; (2) On Transubstantiation; and (3) On the Immaculate Conception. This third coincides so very opportunely with the precise point we have reached in our own controversy with Dr. Pusey, that we shall incorporate our review of it into the present article.

I.

Our controversy with Dr. Pusey stands thus. There are certain doctrines concerning our Blessed Lady, which are taught by the Church whether directly or indirectly; i.e. whether by way of formal decree or in her practical magisterium. We proved the *truth* of these doctrines, in proving the Church's infallibility as "testis" and "magistra"; and all that remained was to answer Dr. Pusey's objections. These are of two totally distinct kinds. Firstly, he contends that such doctrines obscure the thought of God and generate a quasi-idolatry; and to this allegation we replied at length in our last number.* Secondly, he argues that they are at variance with the teaching of Scripture and of Antiquity; and it is to this objection that we now address ourselves. We are to encounter Dr. Pusey (1) on the Immaculate Conception; (2) on the Assumption; and (3) on the body of doctrine underlying that large system of devotion to our Blessed Lady, which the Church inculcates and promotes.

But before we enter in detail upon this task, we will make one preliminary remark as to the general bearing of Scripture and Antiquity on the doctrines in question. There are two most divergent rudimental views concerning our Lady, which may be embraced by those who speculatively accept the doctrine of her Son's Divine Personality. One of these views is very

* [See the first Essay in this volume.]

common among Protestants, and may be thus expressed; though we must apologise to Catholics for being obliged by the exigencies of controversy to utter words, which they will justly regard as so blasphemous and revolting. "Our Lord's Mother was in no respect "pre-eminent among women; the very supposition "that she was so, lessens the significance of what He "did. He showed His loving condescension, as all "Christians are forward to maintain, not only in "assuming our nature, but also in assuming poverty "and obscurity of station. In the same spirit, He "chose not for his Mother a Saint or a heroine, but a "very ordinary every-day woman: pious, no doubt, "up to her light, but not so pious as thousands of "Christians have been since. She lived very con-"tentedly afterwards with her worthy husband the "carpenter, and bore him several children." It is the Catholic view on the contrary, that Mary Most Holy was invested with that full degree of grace and privilege, which was proportioned to so great and unapproachable a dignity as that of Deipara. Here is the essential conflict between the two theories; and one circumstance is at once manifest. If it were really this latter view with which the Apostles imbued the Church's mind, it would follow as a matter of course that each generation should advance on its predecessor in exalting and amplifying her various prerogatives. Earnest meditation would more and more impress on the intellect and imagination of Christians, how much is included in the idea of an Incarnate God; and how unspeakably vast and elevated are the gifts and endow-

ments, which are suitable and proportionate to the office of His Mother.

It is the fundamental issue then of the present controversy, which of these two rudimental views is really divine; and, if we take Dr. Pusey's standard,—Scripture interpreted by Antiquity,—there cannot be so much as the faintest doubt. Whatever difference of detail there may be, in the prerogatives ascribed to Mary by this or that Father;—for the Protestant view, as just now drawn out, no one has so much as alleged the remotest patristic intimation. The Fathers are absolutely unanimous in totally rejecting it; and if they do not speak of it with horror and execration, it is only because they did not conceive of its possible existence. Even the three who have made those anomalous statements concerning the Blessed Virgin which F. Newman has examined (pp. 471–485) with such admirable candour and conspicuous success,—give us here no difficulty. They are no less widely removed from even dreaming of such a notion as the Protestant, than is S. Alphonsus. Then consider the following most decisive fact. If the Protestant notion were correct, our Lady would have had no share in promoting man's Redemption, except as a mere physical instrument; "such as David or Judah may be considered": she would have had no active concern with it, beyond the mere physical circumstance that she gave birth to the Redeemer. Such in fact is apparently Dr. Pusey's own doctrine. But let us consult the Written Word as interpreted by Antiquity. What was the first gleam of light which relieved the dark-

ness of the Fall? How was the very first announcement of future Redemption put forth, on that momentous occasion when the penalties incurred by man were judicially pronounced? The one person, explicitly mentioned by God as Satan's future antagonist, was not Jesus but Mary.* This is no private judgment of ours; nor any invention of modern Rome: it is the one patristic interpretation of Gen. iii. 15.† At a later period of our article we shall speak at greater length on the extraordinary significance of this passage; but we have here said enough on it for our immediate purpose.

Since then Mary, as the Redeemer's Mother, was destined from the first to play so very prominent, so singularly influential a part, in the Church's whole conflict with Satan,—and since the Fathers accepted

* "Inimicitias ponam inter te et *Mulierem*, et semen tuum et semen illius." (Gen. iii. 15.) The question between "Ipse" and "ipsa" is absolutely irrelevant to our present argument, as will be explained in due course.

† "The parallelism" of Mary to Eve "is the doctrine of the Fathers from the earliest times." (F. Newman, p. 384. See F. Harper also, p. 345.) F. Newman proceeds to point out (p. 387) more expressly, what is affirmed by the three ante-Nicene Fathers whom he cites as most indubitably representing Apostolical Tradition. "They unanimously declare that she was not a mere instrument in the Incarnation, such as David or Judah may be considered; they declare that she co-operated in our salvation not merely by the descent of the Holy Ghost upon her body, but by specific holy acts, the effects of the Holy Ghost within her soul; that as Eve forfeited privileges by sin, so Mary earned privileges by the fruits of grace; that as Eve was disobedient and unbelieving, so Mary was obedient and believing; &c. &c."

this as the undoubted sense of Scripture,—there was every reason (as we just now observed) to expect confidently what has in fact taken place. As Christian thought and meditation have expanded from age to age, so has there been a corresponding increase in the ascription of every high privilege to the Deipara, and a more detailed apprehension of her office in co-operating with the work of Redemption. S. Bernardine, S. Alphonsus, Venerable Grignon de Montfort, are as far advanced beyond S. Proclus and S. Cyril (see F. Harper, pp. 412, 413) as these are beyond S. Irenæus and S. Justin;* but it is only because they have more adequately unfolded that rudimental idea, which was conveyed in the Prot-evangel of Genesis. Eve undoubtedly was not the federal head of her posterity, and her offence therefore was not man's ruin; but this single reserve being made, it is difficult to exaggerate the prominence of her personal action in bringing about the Fall. "Mary"—such in effect was God's pronouncement—"shall bear a part in man's Redemption, altogether parallel to that borne by Eve in his destruction. As the first Eve came into direct conflict with Satan and was overthrown, so shall the second Eve come into conflict with him and be victorious. The natural mother of mankind occupied

* It is not quite certain, as we gather from F. Harper's remarks, that the passages attributed to S. Ephrem Syrus, which he quotes (pp. 405–410), are genuine. Whoever wrote them, as F. Harper truly observes, almost anticipated the whole modern development of doctrine concerning Mary. We commend them to the careful consideration of patristic Anglicans.

a secondary indeed but most prominent part, in inflicting on each one of her children the miseries of concupiscence, of ignorance, of sin; and so their spiritual mother shall occupy a secondary indeed but most prominent part, in *relieving* each one of them from the result of those miseries. As the former was the co-enslaver of all men, so shall the latter be their Co-Redemptress from slavery."* The very strongest expressions which Dr. Pusey has quoted from S. Alphonsus and Montfort are no more than the legitimate interpretation of this divine announcement.

II.

The growth within the Church, of those doctrines which concern the Blessed Virgin has been signally evinced, as in other ways, so inclusively in that dogmatic Definition, which will be one principal glory of Pius IX.'s Pontificate. Our first task in the present article is to defend that definition against Dr. Pusey's

* On this phrase, "Co-Redemptress," we spoke in our last number [see pp. 64-66 of the present volume], and F. Harper speaks in p. 338. That the Blessed Virgin was redeemed by her Son, is a truth indeed which cannot be denied without actual heresy. Yet, as Dr. Pusey points out, it is a recognized phrase in many portions of the Church—we think it a very excellent phrase—to say that she was our Co-Redemptress. Pius IX. does not himself call Mary "Co-Redemptrix": but in the Bull "Ineffabilis" he does call her by the no less emphatic appellations, "parentum *reparatricem*; posterorum *vivificatricem*." [See also pp. 111–113 of the present volume.]

objections; or rather to place before our readers the general substance of what F. Harper has urged in detail and at length. On the 8th of December, 1854, the Pontiff decreed as follows :—

"In honour of the most Holy and Undivided Trinity, for the glory and ornament of the Virgin Mother of God, for the exaltation of the Catholic Faith and the spread of the Christian religion, by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and by Our Own, we pronounce and define, that the doctrine, which maintains that the most blessed Virgin Mary in the first moment of her Conception, was, by a singular grace and privilege of Almighty God, in regard of the merits of Christ Jesus the Saviour of the human race, preserved free from the stain of original sin, has been revealed by God, and is therefore to be firmly and constantly believed by all the faithful. Wherefore, if any should presume to think in their heart otherwise than has been defined by us (which God avert!), let them know and understand well, that they are condemned by their own judgment, have suffered shipwreck concerning the faith, and have forsaken the Unity of the Church."

But before we consider what is the doctrine here defined, we must briefly inquire what is the precise proposition ruled by the Church concerning that doctrine. Pius IX. decrees, of course, that every Catholic is bound to believe the Immaculate Conception, with the same firmness of faith with which he believes the Trinity; and that he who doubts the one can no more be called a Catholic than he who doubts

the other. So far there is no question. But further, the Pope declares that the former doctrine "has been revealed by God." Now there are very many ways in which the Apostles may have taught some doctrine as revealed to them by God, distinct from the particular method of *formal and scientific statement;* and so far again there is no difficulty whatever. The difficulty to which we refer consists in this. It has been held by many theologians, that a doctrine may be defined as of faith, which was not itself taught by the Apostles, but which results *by way of logical consequence* from one which they did teach.* Of such a doctrine, they continue, one may truly say that it was revealed by God; because it was revealed by Him "implicitly" or "mediately," as the conclusion is revealed in the premiss. The question then which we would ask is this: Has the Church defined that the Apostles actually taught the Immaculate Conception as revealed by God? or is it consistent with the definition to suppose that this doctrine, without having been actually taught by them, is a legitimate consequence nevertheless of what they did teach? We have been a little disappointed at F. Harper not expressly treating this question; though he implies throughout the

* For instance, Bellarmine. "Id solum est *de fide* quod est à Deo revelatum *mediatè* vel immediatè. . . . Conciliorum decreta . . . tunc solùm faciunt rem *de fide*, cùm explicant verbum Dei *aut inde aliquid deducunt.*" (De Purgatorio, l. i. c. 15, n. 11.) Viva. "Potest à Pontifice definiri *de fide* aliqua *conclusio* descendens ex unâ præmissâ de fide at alterâ moraliter evidente." (Quæstio prodroma de thesibus damnatis, n. 9.) See also Perrone de Immaculato Conceptu, pars. 2, c. 1.

former alternative. See e.g. pp. 349, 418. For ourselves we can but express with much diffidence the bias of our own opinion.

We incline to think that no doctrine can be defined as of faith—or its contradictory therefore condemned as heretical—unless the Apostles actually taught it as revealed by God. This opinion seems rendered far more probable than the other, by the circumstance that the Church so often infallibly censures some tenet as "erroneous"; for she pronounces by that censure, as is generally admitted, that such tenet would lead by legitimate consequence to heresy. Now, according to the opinion which we are now advocating, the distinction is most clear between these respective censures of "heretical" and "erroneous." By condemning a tenet as "heretical," the Church decides that its contradictory was taught by the Apostles as revealed by God; whereas by condemning a tenet as "erroneous," she only decides that its contradictory is the legitimate *consequence* of some doctrine thus taught. But according to the opinion which we oppose, it is difficult to see any difference of meaning whatever between the respective censures "heretical" and "erroneous." This then is one strong reason for our opinion. But we should further add that the Bull "Ineffabilis," which contains the Definition, is worded throughout (as it seems to us) on the implication of the Apostles having themselves taught the Immaculate Conception; and we think also that the faithful generally have been instructed to receive the Definition in that sense. Lastly Dr. Murray, no ordinary authority, has inci-

dentally expressed the same opinion in his work on the Church: d. 17, nn. 10–18.

Still we are not aware that the Church has spoken unmistakeably on the subject. Suppose therefore there were some Catholic, who holds indeed the doctrine as of faith; but who regards it as merely a legitimate *inference* from Apostolic teaching, infallibly guaranteed as a *true* inference by the Church's Definition:—we do not see that his view can be accounted in any way censurable, though certainly we should not ourselves be disposed to accept it. But we sincerely hope that F. Harper, or some other equally competent theologian, may before long give methodical attention to this whole matter.

Next as to the doctrine itself, which has been defined. The Church declares that "the most Blessed Virgin Mary in the first moment of her Conception . . . was preserved free from the stain of original sin." As F. Harper points out, no one can apprehend the true meaning of this statement, who does not first understand what is that "stain of original sin," which all other human persons have inherited from Adam. This then must be our first inquiry; an investigation of the Catholic doctrine on original sin. It will be found that (as might have been expected) all the more essential particulars of this doctrine are absolutely fixed and determined; but it will also be found that there are certain questions, not altogether trifling, which are freely debated among theologians of different schools. F. Harper (pp. 292—316) gives a singularly clear and powerful exposition of that particular theory which he

embraces himself. And from his point of view he is quite right in taking this course; for those who hold his theory are generally of opinion, that no explanation, different from theirs, will enable the controversialist to encounter quite satisfactorily certain specious anti-Catholic objections. For ourselves however,—i.e., for the present writer—it so happens that we belong in some respects to a different theological school;* and our own plan will therefore be somewhat different from his. We shall endeavour to place before our readers an outline of doctrine on original sin, which may be sufficiently definite for our purpose, while nevertheless it may be one which Catholics of every school will be willing to accept.

Original sin is called a "macula"; *habitual* sin is also called a "macula": and we think that much light will be thrown on the former, if we first consider the latter. Let us begin by making the imaginary supposition, that man had not been raised into the supernatural order; and let us further suppose that he had nevertheless as clear and full a knowledge of God's Existence as he now possesses. Under such circum-

* This is no fit occasion for attempting any kind of argument on these questions, which have very little connection with the doctrine concerning our Blessed Lady. The present writer therefore will merely say, (1) that he cannot follow F. Harper on the relations between "natura pura" and "natura lapsa"; (2) still less can he admit that the Church has decided in favour of F. Harper's view, by censuring Baius's 55th proposition (p. 293); nor (3) does he think that S. Augustine ever uses the word "peccatum" to express a morally virtuous act of the natural order (p. 313, note

stances I have committed my first grave sin.* My sin is now done and over; but my *state*, my habitual *condition*, has lamentably deteriorated. In particular I now suffer under two unspeakable miseries: (1) the "reatus culpæ," for I am under God's grave displeasure; and (2) the "reatus pœnæ æternæ," for I justly deserve, nay am under sentence of, eternal punishment. This is the condition of "habitual sin." It is a *condition*, not an *act*; but I have fallen into that condition, through my own free and deliberate act. Further, we may well suppose God to have promised that, on my eliciting an act of genuine contrition, He will forgive me. This being so, I proceed to make the requisite act. Immediately my condition of "habitual sin" is at an end: I am no longer under God's grave displeasure, nor under the sentence of eternal punishment. Yet even now certain evil effects or "pœnalities" of my sin remain: thus (1) I am still under a debt of temporal punishment; and (2) my past sin has increased my proclivity to evil.

According however to God's present appointment, there is a further particular to be taken into account. Man has been raised into the supernatural order; he is visited by supernatural auxilia; and at Baptism he has been clothed with that supernatural gift, which is called "habitual grace." Now, whether it be by God's free and most congruous appointment, or whether it be from the very necessity of the case,—for on this theologians differ—so it is, that habitual grace cannot

* As distinct from *venial*. For obvious reasons we avoid the phrase "mortal sin."

co-exist with God's grave displeasure. I have been baptized, we will say, in infancy. So soon as I commit my first grave sin, that sin is mortal; it kills habitual grace; and I fall into the state or condition of "habitual sin." On the other hand, so soon as I have made the necessary act of supernatural contrition—or so soon as I have approached the sacrament of Penance with due dispositions—habitual grace at once re-enters. In the case then of all baptized persons,* there are three different attributes indissolubly united with each other at any given moment: either all three are together present, or all three are together absent. Every baptized person is either a "peccator"; i.e., (1) destitute of habitual grace; (2) involved in the reatus culpæ; and (3) involved in the reatus pœnæ æternæ:—or else he is a "justus"; i.e., clothed in habitual grace, and exempt from both of those two reatus. Yet even a "justus" may still be liable to certain pœnalities in retribution for past acts of sin. Lastly, "habitual sin" means precisely the *condition* of a "peccator," whenever that condition has been brought about by the man's own past sin.

So much on habitual sin. Now consider me at the very moment when I have completed my first mortal sin after Baptism. It is imaginable—whether or no it is under any circumstances possible—that God shall create a man who is in every single respect my fac-simile. His soul and body in the first place would be precise counterparts of mine; and so far there is

* In fact, in the case of *all* persons; but this cannot be explained till original sin is considered.

no appearance of perplexity. But further—and this is the relevant matter—his *condition* also is (by hypothesis) a precise counterpart of mine. In other words, he is destitute of habitual grace; he is under God's grave displeasure; and he is under a just sentence of eternal punishment. Moreover, besides this, he lies under certain pœnalities on which we need not enlarge. Yet at last, there must always remain this one ineffaceable difference between him and me; that I have been brought into this condition by my own sin, whereas he has been created in it by Almighty God. Now this will give a good idea of what is *meant* by "original sin." Not in consequence of *their own* past sin, but in consequence of *Adam's* past sin, all human persons (putting aside our Blessed Lady) on their first creation are "peccatores." (1) They are destitute of habitual grace; (2) they are in some sense under God's grave displeasure; (3) they are under the just sentence of a punishment which is to last for ever, whether that punishment be positive or negative.* These three particulars are integrating parts of "original sin." But over and above original sin itself, men have been punished for Adam's sin by certain pœnalities, which remain even when original sin is remitted. And these pœnalities are indeed most serious; for they include not merely mental and bodily anguish, and death, but the far more serious miseries of concupiscence and ignorance. Lastly, Adam's *personal* sin is sometimes called "peccatum originale *originans*"; and the *state*

* For ourselves we heartily follow F. Harper in the latter alternative. See pp. 305-308.

or *condition* of original sin, in which we are created one by one, is called "peccatum originale *originatum*."

The doctrine then of the Immaculate Conception, as defined by the Church, is neither more nor less than this: that the Mother of God was never for one instant a "peccatrix;" that when her soul was created, it was at once (for the sake of Christ's foreseen merits) clothed in habitual grace; and that she began existence therefore as "justa." The defined doctrine in no way denies that she sinned *in Adam*, as did the rest of his natural posterity; on this question we shall say a very few words in a later part of our article. Nor does the doctrine deny that she was placed under certain pœnalities in consequence of Adam's sin; viz., sorrow, bodily suffering, and death (see F. Harper, p. 334). It does not deny that she lay under a prospective sentence of original sin, from the moment of Adam's sin to the moment of her own creation; it only denies that such sentence (if it existed) was ever put into execution.

Now, as F. Harper has pointed out (pp. 319–321), it is impossible to read the Eirenicon, without seeing that its writer utterly misapprehended the Catholic doctrine. But F. Harper does not seem aware, that "habemus confitentem reum"; that Dr. Pusey addressed a letter to the "Guardian" newspaper of January 24, 1866, from which the following is an extract:—

"I understand that Roman divines hold that all which is defined is that the soul of the Blessed Virgin was infused into her body, and was preserved both from guilt and taint of original sin for the merits of

our Lord by Whom she was redeemed, and that nothing is defined as to the 'active conception,' i.e., that of her body. In this case the words 'in primo instante conceptionis suæ,' must be used in regard to the blessed Virgin in a different sense from that in which S. Thomas uses it of our Lord. The immaculateness of the conception would then differ in degree not in kind from that of Jeremiah, who was sanctified in his mother's womb."

The Catholic who sees this letter will at once ask with amazement, what imaginable interpretation could Dr. Pusey have affixed to the Papal decree, when he wrote the Eirenicon. Our readers will find his own explanation in the Eirenicon, p. 148; and in another sentence which F. Harper quotes in p. 324: but we confess ourselves, after all, unable even to conjecture what *is* the strange tenet he ascribed to Catholics. Did Mary exist then as a person, before her soul was created? or was it created, before it was infused into her body? or was Mary in original sin, before there was any such person as Mary? But whatever this strange tenet may be, Dr. Pusey is even now far from certain that the great majority of Catholics do not hold it; for even in his "Guardian" letter he will commit himself to no further proposition, than that this indescribable and unimaginable tenet has not been actually "defined."

Dr. Pusey, it will have been observed, virtually urges that S. Thomas uses the word "conception" in a different sense from Pius IX. This remark is by no means new; on the contrary it has been made again and again by Catholic writers, for the purpose of

showing that in S. Thomas's time the point at issue was incorrectly apprehended.* But for the last four hundred years (to speak much within the mark) all such misapprehensions have entirely ceased; nor was it possible for Dr. Pusey to have read with care one single work, great or small, on either side of the controversy, without learning what both parties *meant* by the "Immaculate Conception."

In fact, the distinction unanimously made by later writers, between the "active" and "passive" conception, appertains to the very grammar of the subject; and yet Dr. Pusey has totally failed to grasp it. The "active conception" is related to the "passive," just as "producing" is related to "being produced." Take our Lord's Miraculous Conception. The "active conception" was the Holy Ghost's miraculous agency; while the "passive conception" was the first existence of that Sacred Humanity, which resulted from the said agency. Mary's "passive conception," then, was her first existence as a human person; and it could not therefore possibly take place, until her soul was infused into her body. "The first moment of her conception" had not, and could not have, any other meaning, than "the first moment of her soul's creation."

Almighty God then commands that the doctrine, now explained, shall be received with faith no less firm and unreserved, than the doctrine of the Trinity

* See for instance Perrone's note at the beginning of part 1, c. 3, in his admirable little work on the definableness of the Immaculate Conception.

or of the Incarnation; because it comes before Christians guaranteed by the selfsame authority. We have nothing here to do with *proving* this conclusion; because it is established by every argument, which shows that the Church in communion with Rome is the one Catholic Church. Here we have only to meet the objections made by Dr. Pusey against the doctrine, whether derived from Scripture or from Antiquity. And first, for those general expressions of S. Paul, to which Dr. Pusey vaguely refers. They are recited by F. Harper in p. 329.

Rom. iii. 23—"Omnes peccaverunt et egent gloriâ Dei." It is perfectly clear to our mind from the context, that the "omnes" here expresses "all adults who did not live by faith"; and that "peccaverunt" refers to actual mortal sin.

Rom. v. 12. This verse undoubtedly seems, on the surface, to imply that all men sinned in Adam, and were sentenced for that sin. "Ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον" should be translated indeed, no doubt, as F. Harper translates it,—"in that," or "forasmuch as," all sinned. Still the meaning is absolutely identical with the well-known Vulgate version, "in quo omnes peccaverunt"; for when fully drawn out the sense is, "forasmuch as all sinned *in Adam*." These words undoubtedly demand the attention of those who hold, as we are disposed to do, that Mary did *not* sin in Adam; but as against the Immaculate Conception, they have not the very slightest force. F. Harper understands them as easily, and applies them to our Blessed Lady as unreservedly, as does Dr. Pusey

himself. Precisely the same remark may be made on Rom. v. 18, and on 1 Cor. xv. 22; which latter F. Harper has accidentally omitted.

2 Cor. v. 14.—"If" Christ "died for all, then" without Christ "all were dead." The one obvious sense of these words is admitted by every Catholic without exception. Most assuredly, without Christ Mary was dead: she owed her sanctification exclusively to His merits.

Dr. Pusey argues also, not only from the language, but from the silence of Scripture. As regards those doctrines in general which concern our Blessed Lady, we shall have much to say in a later part of our article on the silence of Scripture; but as regards this particular dogma, two brief replies amply suffice. Firstly, Scripture does in one place (Gen. iii. 15) manifestly imply it, as will be seen in a later part of our article But, secondly, Catholics altogether deny Dr. Pusey's assumed premiss; Catholics altogether deny that a doctrine must be contained in Scripture, in order to its definition. But this, of course, is not the place for a discussion on the Rule of Faith.

We proceed then to Dr. Pusey's objections from Antiquity; and under this head we need do little more, than refer to the admirable treatment which those objections have received from F. Harper. Our thesis is, that the Apostles taught the Immaculate Conception, whether explicitly or implicitly; and our contention is, that no single fact adduced by Dr. Pusey tends to invest this thesis with any kind of improbability. But one previous explanation must be made,

in accordance with something which has already been said, as regards this word "implicitly." We shall never so use the word as to say that the Apostles taught a doctrine "implicitly," if we only mean that they taught a *premiss,* or *premisses,* from which that doctrine is legitimately *deduced;* we shall only apply the word to what they *actually* and *immediately* taught. They taught a doctrine "explicitly," if they taught it in the way of direct and formal statement; they taught it "implicitly," if they impressed it on their disciples in some way different from this. Take the following illustration:—A friend of mine, whom I have always known most intimately, dies; and I am desirous that my children, who have never seen him, shall cherish his memory, and be well acquainted with his character. Some particulars of that character indeed are fully implied in certain anecdotes which I recount; but, not content with this, I explain to them such particulars as accurately and precisely as I can. Other particulars are profoundly impressed on their mind, by a number of vivid and illustrative facts which I have told them; but I do not attempt any *analysis* of these particulars. Lastly, other features of his character are really made known to my children through various acts and speeches of his which I recount to them; but these features do not hold at all a prominent place, in the mental picture which they form of him. The truths then, which I have taught my children concerning his character, are divisible into three classes: of the first, my teaching has been both "explicit" and "emphatic"; of the second, "emphatic," though

only "implicit"; of the third, not "implicit" only, but also "unemphatic," yet indubitably actual and immediate. The bearing of this on Apostolic teaching is obvious: we would only explain, that whatever the Apostles taught *explicitly*, by that very circumstance they taught *emphatically*. We maintain then, that the Apostles not merely knew the Immaculate Conception, but imparted it as divinely revealed; that the picture of our Blessed Lady, impressed by them on the intellect and imagination of the Church as having been divinely testified, was utterly inconsistent with any notion, that she had once been under God's displeasure and a child of wrath. But we are prepared to admit, that their inculcation of this doctrine was neither explicit nor even emphatic; that their main urgency and stress were laid on verities still more central and paramount.

We are now therefore to consider, how far any historical argument, urged by Dr. Pusey, militates against this proposition. We wish indeed he had stated in his letter to the "Guardian," whether his fresh discoveries on the doctrine's true sense have modified his opinion of its divergence from Antiquity. But as he has been silent on this head, we suppose we must infer that he still regards it as an "insoluble difference between the modern Roman and the ancient Church" (p. 121). Now, in order to appreciate this statement, it will be necessary to contemplate the "ancient Church" at two different periods; and we will begin with that which elapsed, between the Apostles' death and the public appearance of Pelagius.

On what ground does Dr. Pusey hold that the Fathers of that period disbelieved the Immaculate Conception? We are not aware of any answer that he will make, except that not one of them mentioned her exemption from original sin.* But does he merely mean by this, that not one of them expressly and distinctly declared that exemption? or does he mean that not one of them implied it? If he intends the former, his argument is suicidal. Let him give any exposition of the doctrine of original sin, which he shall consider scientifically accurate and sufficient; and let him then name any one Father, before the rise of Pelagius, who expressly stated that doctrine as applicable to mankind in general. Dr. Pusey will doubtless reply, that before the Pelagian controversy arose, there was no occasion for any Father to state expressly the Church's doctrine on original sin. The legitimate appeal, he will add, is not to what they expressly state, but to what they imply and manifestly hold. So far we fully agree with him. But we would earnestly suggest, that if the absence of express patristic testimony disproved the apostolicity of the Immaculate Conception, it would

* We avoid in our present article the question of our Lady's freedom from actual sin, because we find with extreme pleasure by the "Union Review" of last July (p. 395), that Dr. Pusey himself admits that exemption. It is well known that one or two Fathers speak strangely on the subject; and we have already commemorated F. Newman's most candid and satisfactory treatment of their language. But it is one thing to say, that on this or that occasion she was betrayed into a slight infirmity; and a very different thing indeed to say, that she was once the enemy of God and a child of wrath.

equally disprove the apostolicity of original sin. And further we would point out, that those Fathers who do not expressly and definitely mention original sin at all, could not by possibility expressly mention our Lady's exemption therefrom.

Dr. Pusey will no doubt maintain, that the pre-Augustinian Fathers embraced implicitly that very doctrine on original sin, which the Church afterwards defined; and that they exhibit this belief in various parts of their writings. Every Catholic, we need hardly say, will be fully prepared for such a conclusion, and will view with pleasure the evidence which Dr. Pusey can adduce in its favour. But did these Fathers imply, we ask him, not merely that mankind in general, but that the Most Holy Virgin in particular, was once an enemy of God and a child of the devil? Most certainly he adduces no such passage; we never saw any such passage adduced; we entirely disbelieve that any such passage exists. Yet it is important to point out that, even if several such passages *were* producible, no kind of difficulty would hence accrue to the Catholic controversialist: for nothing is more readily imaginable, than that a doctrine, which the Apostles taught indeed, but taught implicitly and unemphatically,—should in this or that particular time have faded from the consciousness of some particular portion of the Church. You will ask in reply, "But can it have *totally* faded? must there not be *some* echo in later times of Apostolic preaching?" This is the very point at which we are aiming. Let Dr. Pusey assume, if he pleases—though such a notion is totally unfounded—

that this or that pre-Augustinian Father implies a denial of the Immaculate Conception: still it is absolutely certain that a series of Fathers from the first implied its affirmation; and this is the argument on which we are now to insist.

It is "the doctrine of the Fathers from the earliest times," says F. Newman (p. 382)—and he demonstrates it to be the doctrine of S. Justin, S. Irenæus, and Tertullian—that Mary is the woman divinely prophesied, as Satan's direct and immediate enemy in that great scheme of Redemption which God was announcing. Can these Fathers have imagined, that the person thus marked out began her existence as the enemy, not of Satan, but of God? as under just sentence of eternal banishment from His vision? as stained (to use F. Harper's expression) with the mark of diabolic victory? We suppose the very idea was never suggested to them: but had they been asked the question, no one surely can doubt that they would have answered it in the negative, and that too with amazement and disgust.

Passing to the third century, F. Harper quotes the following from S. Hippolytus: "The Lord was without sin, made according to His human nature of *two incorruptible woods*, i.e. of the Virgin and the Holy Ghost" (p. 402). S. Hippolytus then calls her "incorruptible," in the same breath in which he calls the Holy Ghost Incorruptible. What would have been his wonder at the notion that she was once a "peccatrix"! Observe also, in this early Father, that closely united mention of the Holy Ghost and the Blessed Virgin,

which so shocks Dr. Pusey in the Venerable Grignon de Montfort.

We will not quote the most impressive passages attributed to S. Gregory Thaumaturgus; because F. Harper intimates (p. 404) some doubt of their genuineness: and we will proceed, therefore, to S. Dionysius of Alexandria. F. Harper mentions that his letter was written by the authority, and as the expression of the doctrine, of the great Antiochene Council (p. 405). He calls our Lady "a virginal paradise"; and declares that Christ "preserved her incorruptible and blessed from head to foot." No sober man surely will consider it possible that the Saint can have written thus strongly and unreservedly, had it occurred to him as an opinion imaginably existing among Catholics, that she had once been in bondage to corruption and under the curse of God.

This implicit belief in the Immaculate Conception, so far from terminating with the three first centuries, exhibited itself on the contrary (as might have been expected) with continually increasing significance, prominence, intensity. Abundant proof of this proposition is furnished by F. Harper (pp. 405—416); and his summing up at the end is amply warranted by the extracts which have gone before. We will place before our readers this most beautiful and forcible passage, putting into italics those portions of it to which we would invite particular attention.

"Who can be so blinded with prejudice as not to perceive in these quotations, borrowed from successive

centuries, an Apostolic tradition, *which is as far removed from the least heterodox conception of Mary professed by Protestants, as heaven is from earth?* Voices reach us from Syria—from different parts of Africa,—from Mesopotamia,—from Phœnicia,—from Milan,—Constantinople,—from Jerusalem, from the shores of the Tiber,—from Mount Sinai,—from Rome,—from Lyons,—which, one and all, conspire in ascribing to Mary *an immaculate purity of soul, mind, and body:—a solitary pre-eminence in God's creation of grace.* The similitudes which they employ, have a wondrous identity. Types are borrowed everywhere from the Old Testament of all that is most holy and most singular in Divine Benediction. The expressions which all these Fathers concur in adopting,—the ideas which they spread in every place of their habitation,—contain within them the germ, at least,* of the doctrine of Mary's Immaculate Conception. *She is that virgin earth, out of which Adam was formed:*—earth, which was still fresh from the solemn blessing of its Creator;—earth, which had not as yet been condemned because of Adam's sin, to bring forth thorns and thistles. *She is the incorruptible wood,* out of which the great ark of our salvation was formed. No blasting breath of the Fall had rotted it; no worm of concupiscence had pierced its virginal incorruption. *She is the fleece of Gideon, watered with celestial dew, while the rest of the earthly creation was withered up with a drought of grace.* She mounts, with the acclaiming voice of Eastern and Western Church, above Angels and Archangels; above Thrones, Dominations, and Principalities; above Powers and Virtues; above Cherubim and Seraphim. Doctors of East and West place Her *on the pinnacle of creation.* The tongue of Patriarchs and Doctors fails them, when they would attempt to

* [But surely even more than the germ.]

sound Her praises. Examine the picture well, take in its background, study each finishing stroke of the pencil. And then put before you, as the original, *one who has been blighted, (let it be but for an instant, it matters little,) with the curse of original sin.* The trail of the serpent has been upon her soul; she has been once at enmity with God, 'a child of wrath,' deprived of sanctifying grace; the dark mark of Adam, omen of evil, on her. Who would be able to repress a smile when he heard that she was like to the incorruptible wood of the ark; like to the virgin earth of innocent Paradise; or higher, beyond power of created idea or speech, than Angels, Cherubim and Seraphim? What a triumph to the devils! What a dishonour to the choirs of heaven! What an insult to the Divine Son of Mary!—a triumph to the devils, because one who had once been stained by their mark of victory was raised to the highest rank in creation; a dishonour to the sinless Angels, because their constituted Queen had once been subject to the taint of sin; an insult to the Son, because an infamy to the Mother. *The idea then of her Immaculate Conception was latent, yet living in the consciousness of the Church.* But for a time she, guided as ever by the Holy Spirit, was occupied with the definition of more important mysteries. She was indelibly fixing in Her creed the doctrines of the Blessed Trinity, and of the Incarnation, amid the terrible conflict of sects and heresies. She needed a time of religious peace and stillness, that she might be able to fix the place of the Bright Morning Star in the new Heaven. Yet the Divinely-revealed idea was there, and soon began to show its stem above the earth" (pp. 416—418).

It is well known that the first Father who expressly treated of original sin, was S. Augustine; and Dr. Pusey is of course very desirous of showing, that he

included our Blessed Lady in his general doctrine. Even had he done so, there would have been nothing to surprise Catholics. What the Apostles taught unemphatically in the first century, may well have been forgotten in Africa before the fifth. Nay, even had the true Apostolic impression by no means been effaced from the African Church, it was not at all unnatural that, in the ardour of conflict against a most detestable heresy, S. Augustine should have failed in giving due weight to a tradition, which, as all admit, had never at that time been reduced to an express and scientific shape. It is therefore the more remarkable, and testifies more strongly to the strength of this tradition, that (as F. Harper has satisfactorily shown) he did not really run counter to it at all. Indeed, more than this may be said. So far from being insensible to the implicit but living tradition on Mary's sinlessness, he was (we believe) the first writer who gave to that tradition a definite and formal expression. We refer, of course, to the following most widely-celebrated passage :—

"Except, therefore, the Holy Virgin Mary, about whom, on account of the honour of the Lord, I will not allow the question to be entertained, when sins are under discussion;—for how do we know what increase of grace was bestowed on her, to enable her to overcome sin in every way, Who merited to conceive, and bring forth Him, Who, as is plain, had no sin;—with the exception therefore, of this Virgin, if we could gather together all those male and female saints, while they were living here below, and could ask them whether they were without sin; what answer do we

think that they would give?"—Quoted by F. Harper in p. 364.

Dr. Pusey indeed attempts to wrest this passage from its indubitable sense, and would limit it to Mary's exemption from actual sin. But firstly consider the words merely in their own light. S. Augustine held it inconsistent with the Lord's due honour, to suppose that His Mother even for an instant consented to one passing emotion, which was at variance with the most perfect resignation and humility. Surely the Saint must have thought it very far *more* inconsistent with the Lord's due honour, to imagine that His Mother had once been His enemy; had once been under a just sentence of eternal banishment from His Presence.

The same conclusion follows no less clearly from considering the circumstances of the time, and the point really at issue between S. Augustine and his antagonist. This is most admirably shown by F. Harper from p. 364 to p. 368. Julian was dwelling on the exemption of so many Saints from *actual* sin, as a proof against S. Augustine's doctrine on *original* sin. "Undoubtedly," answers S. Augustine in effect, "I admit one of your instances, but I will admit no other. The Lord's Mother, I grant, committed no actual sin; and in regard to her therefore I cannot maintain, that she was involved in the original stain of our nature." This last clause is undoubtedly requisite, in order to give S. Augustine's words any intelligible meaning.

But then, rejoins Dr. Pusey, S. Augustine cannot have meant this, because he frequently speaks of our

Lady as having been born (much more therefore conceived) in original sin. On this assertion F. Harper joins issue; and examines every single Augustinian passage, adduced or adducible by his opponent. Nothing can be more complete than Dr. Pusey's overthrow. By far the strongest expression which he cites, is the phrase "caro peccati" applied to our Lady. The true reading is here by no means certain (p. 371, note); but the most superficial reader of S. Augustine is well aware, that with him "caro peccati" would naturally signify, "flesh derived from Adam in the ordinary way of natural descent."

Two of the passages adduced by Dr. Pusey (those numbered by F. Harper 7th and 8th, in p. 370), instead of having any force against the Immaculate Conception, tell decidedly in its favour; the latter of the two very strongly so indeed. (See F. Harper, pp. 372, 373.) At the same time we frankly confess, in agreement with our author, that they show S. Augustine to have been entirely of F. Harper's mind, in attributing to our Lady the "*debitum proximum* contrahendi originale peccatum": a question on which no one pretends that the Church has spoken.

From the first-quoted Augustinian passage, a most important inference may be drawn against Anglican controversialists; nay, and would follow, even if Dr. Pusey's most unreasonable interpretation of it could be admitted. It is absolutely certain from it, that when S. Augustine uttered various universally-sounding propositions,—as to "all Adam's posterity being infected with sin" and the like,—he never intended

that those propositions should include the Mother of God. And since all the Church's definitions against the Pelagian or semi-Pelagian heresy have been drawn up under S. Augustine's influence—many of them in his very words—in regard to *them* also a similar conclusion follows.

Dr. Pusey's other historical objections against the Immaculate Conception are so miscellaneous and so destitute of even apparent force, that it is not worth while to pursue them. We will, therefore, but refer our readers to F. Harper's crushing reply: pp. 350–364; and pp. 376–384. In the following passage our author thus moderately sums up the net result of his opponent's argument from Antiquity :—

"And now let us pause for one moment to look back upon the nature of Dr. Pusey's proof. His object, we must repeat, was to demonstrate that this dogma has no foundation in Antiquity. It is of course difficult enough to prove a negative. Still, after all, there is a species of moral evidence possible to this class of propositions. If the Oxford Professor could have constructed a catena of Fathers,—representatives of Apostolic tradition in successive centuries,—all of whom plainly declared that our Lady had been born in original sin, no one would have denied that he had in great measure made out his case. But, as a fact, what is the proof that he affords us of his assertion? Melchior Canus, a MS., and two Fathers, one of the Western, the other of the Eastern Church. These are the sum total of his authorities. Melchior Canus changes into Erasmus;* the MS. cannot of course be

* We incline to think that Canus more completely denies all patristic evidence for the doctrine, than F. Harper (p. 363) is willing to admit.

put in evidence; and the two Fathers, when their words are carefully examined, and collated with the context and other passages in their writings, are so far from justifying Dr. Pusey's charge, that they help to disprove it. Now it is not our business to find fault with the meagreness of his proof. *It is true that, by consulting Plazza or Perrone, he might have indefinitely swelled the proportion of his note. But we have no right to interfere with this self-elected poverty,* if he deemed it expedient to adopt it. We have, however, a just right to complain of the way in which he has simply *ignored the labours of our greatest theologians, who have proved that the doctrine has a very solid foundation in Antiquity.* Either he did not know of the works of Suarez, Vasquez, De Valentia, Plazza, Perrone, &c.; and in such case he was not justified in making so sweeping an assertion. Or he did know of their works; in which case nothing can excuse him from intemperate rashness. The only proper course open to him was, either to have shown that the abundant evidence produced by these theologians failed to sustain their cause, or to have abstained from pronouncing judgment on the question at all. If grave subjects like these,—dogmas of the Catholic Church,—were to be treated in such sort by theological writers generally, we might as well destroy the erudition of centuries at once. For it would become simply useless. Controversies would be ever repeating themselves; and Divine Theology, the Queen of Sciences, would never 'grow to the full knowledge of the Son of God,' because it would be ever going round in a circle, like a blind horse at its grindstone" (pp. 37—56).

In our preceding remarks we have not attempted to *prove* the Immaculate Conception. That doctrine has been defined by the Roman Catholic Church; and

an article on our Blessed Lady is not the proper place for establishing the infallibility of that Church. We have but professed then a reply, under F. Harper's guidance, to Dr. Pusey's objections, whether taken from Scripture or from Antiquity. But, in fact, our conclusions have not been only negative: they have been also importantly positive. It has (1) been alleged that there is one text of Scripture (Gen. iii. 15) which points irresistibly to the doctrine; and (2) it has been shown that patristic dicta, from the very first, afford the strongest presumption of its Apostolicity.

III.

Mary then never contracted original sin. But a further question may imaginably be asked; viz., whether she incurred the "debitum proximum" of contracting it. This question has no proper part in our controversy with Dr. Pusey; because (as we have already mentioned) no one dreams of supposing, that the Church has directly or indirectly answered it in the negative. At the same time it is very closely connected with that of the Immaculate Conception; and we hope therefore we may be excused, if we introduce a very few words on the subject. We are the rather inclined to do so, because we are ourselves more than disposed to answer the question in a negative sense; and because we venture to think that F. Harper—holding as he does the opposite view—has not done full justice to the doctrine which we ourselves prefer. We will not indeed attempt to set forth the arguments

adducible in its behalf; but at least we may state it in a methodical shape, and attempt to appreciate its theological position.*

What then is that doctrine which various theologians have maintained, on Mary's exemption from the debitum proximum of original sin? We would firstly beg our readers to reperuse from [p. 136 to p. 141 of this volume]; and we will next add a few further explanations, supplementary of what has there been said. God made "a virtual compact with Adam as progenitor and moral head of the whole human family" (F. Harper, p. 300). The interests of Adam's posterity were most closely bound up with his own. If he avoided mortal sin, his descendants were to be immaculately conceived, and to retain original justice. But if he sinned mortally, they were to bear a large share in the consequences of that sin: one by one, as they came into existence, they were to be destitute of habitual grace, lying under God's wrath, meriting eternal banishment from His Presence, and visited with various other miseries. Adam did sin mortally. At that very moment, to use the recognised phrase, those who were to descend from him according to the ordinary methods of human generation, "sinned *in* him"; i.e., they were at that moment, in retribution of his sin, sentenced to a prospective punishment, analogous to what they *would* have endured had they personally sinned. Or, to

* [In my original article I attempted more than this: see pp. 476—489 for October, 1866. But on reflection I think I fell into a mistake by making this attempt; though I still entirely hold all which I there maintained.]

use equally recognised theological words, they incurred the "debitum proximum contrahendi originale peccatum." The precise question at issue, then, is this. Did the virtual compact with Adam include *all* those descended from him in the ordinary way of nature? When he transgressed the precept, did *all* these sin in him? Did *all* these incur the debitum proximum? Or was there one memorable exception? Was Mary, through Christ's merits, exempted from any share whatever in the prospective sentence? Did Mary, or did she not, sin in Adam? It is of faith (as we have seen) that in her case no such prospective sentence ever became actual; that she was sanctified at the very moment of her creation. But theologians have further inquired, whether even prospectively she incurred that sentence. For brevity's sake we will call the doctrine, which gives a negative answer to this inquiry, the doctrine of her "Immunity."*

Now Raynaudus, who himself opposes this doctrine, confesses nevertheless that "innumerable" modern theologians support it. Among its advocates is included S. Alphonsus, all whose works (as is well

* We should explain that the term "debitum proximum" is opposed to the term "debitum *remotum*." Of course Mary was one of that *class*—those descending from Adam by the ordinary method of generation—against whom the prospective sentence was issued, that they should be conceived in original sin. This is what is meant by her incurring the "debitum remotum" of original sin. But those who advocate the Immunity, maintain that she individually was excepted from the otherwise universal doom of her class, and that against her no such sentence was prospectively issued.

known) were examined with a view to his prospective canonization.* There can be no possible question therefore that any Catholic has full liberty of embracing this doctrine, to whom it may appear theologically well-founded.

The theological arguments in its favour are to our mind extremely strong; but we have already said that we shall not attempt to exhibit them. We will only say generally, that the very proposition, "Mary sinned in Adam," seems on the surface at variance with the general spirit of Catholic Tradition, as to her exemption from everything which savours of sin; and also with the "Preamble" to the Definition of the Immaculate Conception. So strongly does this seem to us the case, that we think one might have almost augured beforehand, that there must have been some powerful theological argument to restrain so many doctors and ardent lovers of Mary from embracing the doctrine of her Immunity. Certainly in fact there is one, which will justly have the very greatest weight until it receives an entirely satisfactory answer.

It is a most certain verity, not only that Mary was redeemed by her Son, but that she was redeemed by His *death*. Now the doctrine of the Immunity does not present any difficulty even on the surface, in the way of believing that Mary was redeemed by Jesus. This is plain, because those who uphold that doctrine consider, as a matter of course, that her exemption from the debitum proximum was entirely due to her Son's foreseen

* [S. Alphonsus, I need hardly say, is now a Doctor of the Church.]

merits. The Bull "Ineffabilis" declares that, by her Immaculate Conception, she was "redeemed in a sublimer manner" than the rest of mankind. It is obvious then to apply this principle to our present theme. If to be *preserved* from sin is a higher Redemption than to be *cleansed* from it—by parity of reason to be *exempt* from its sentence is a still higher Redemption than the mere *remission* of that sentence.

It is most easy then to reconcile the doctrine of her Immunity, with the doctrine of her having been redeemed by her Son: the difficulty is to reconcile it with the doctrine of her having been redeemed by her Son's *death*. Those theologians who hold the Immunity have laboured with great earnestness—some (we think) with far greater success than others—in encountering this difficulty. Our own humble suggestion would be as follows. We proceed on the basis—the far more common one among theologians—that God's decree of the Incarnation is dependent (according to human methods of apprehension) on His foresight of the Fall. Secondly we follow Salazar's opinion, that God's decree of creating Mary is dependent (again according to human methods of apprehension) on His decree of the Incarnation. And these two foundations being supposed, we submit that the difficulty we have mentioned vanishes. In decreeing to create Mary, God redeems her, by His Son's foreseen passion and death, from the sentence which every other carnal descendant of Adam incurred.

IV.

Here we return from our little digression, to the general course of our argument. We pass to the doctrine of her Assumption. Under this doctrine, strictly so called, are not included, of course, the various circumstances mentioned by tradition as accompanying the event, but only the event itself. This event is, that Mary's body was not permitted to see corruption; but, on the contrary, was speedily reunited to her soul and raised into heaven. Dr. Pusey complains (p. 150) that, on Roman Catholic principles, this doctrine is no less certain now, than the Immaculate Conception was before it had been defined. But we think that he has under-stated the matter. For our own part we would submit, that the doctrine of the Assumption, as being everywhere taught by Pope and bishops, is infallibly guaranteed as true.* But even apart from the Church's authority, we can hardly imagine any

* F. Harper sanctions this principle. "Dr. Pusey," he says, "complains that '*any doctrine being taught everywhere at this present moment was to be a proof of a Divine tradition that it had been always*' (implicitly at least) '*taught*'; i.e., that it had been always contained, at least virtually, in the sacred Deposit of the Faith. Yet *who would suppose otherwise, who really and honestly believes in the infallibility of the Church?* Would the Holy Spirit—the Spirit of the truth—allow the whole Church to go wrong, for one moment of time, in Her collective doctrinal teaching? For that moment, the mystical Body of Christ is involved in error. For that moment, the gates of hell have prevailed. For that moment, our Lord's solemn promise has been broken" (p. 390).

Catholic to ponder on the other doctrines which concern our Blessed Lady, and then to doubt that this is their legitimate consequence and completion. We have nowhere seen this argument so powerfully enforced, as it was some years ago by F. Newman: we italicize a few clauses.

"It was surely fitting then, it was becoming, that she should be taken up into heaven and not lie in the grave till Christ's second coming, who had passed a life of sanctity and of miracle such as hers. . . . It would be a greater miracle if, her life being what it was, her death was like that of other men, than if it were such as to correspond to her life. Who can conceive, my brethren, that God *should so repay the debt He condescended to owe to His Mother for His human Body, as to allow the flesh and blood from which it was taken to moulder in the grave?* Do the sons of men thus deal with their mothers? Do they not nourish and sustain them in their feebleness, and keep them in life while they are able? Or who can conceive that *that virginal frame, which never sinned, was to undergo the death of a sinner?* Why should she share the curse of Adam, *who had no share in his fall?* 'Dust thou art, and into dust thou shalt return,' was the sentence upon sin; *she then who was not a sinner, fitly never saw corruption.* She died then, my brethren, because even our Lord and Saviour died; she died, as she suffered, because she was in this world, because she was in a state of things in which suffering and death was the rule. . . . Her departure made no noise in the world. The Church went about her common duties, preaching, converting, suffering; there were persecutions, there was fleeing from place to place, there were martyrs, there were triumphs; at length the rumour spread through Christendom that Mary

was no longer upon earth. Pilgrims went to and fro; they sought for her relics, but these were not; did she die at Ephesus? or did she die at Jerusalem? Accounts varied; but her tomb could not be pointed out, or, if it was found, it was open; and instead of her pure and fragrant body, there was a growth of lilies from the earth which she had touched. So inquirers went home marvelling, and waiting for further light. And then the tradition came, wafted westward on the aromatic breeze, how that when the time of her dissolution was at hand, . . . the Apostles were suddenly gathered together in one place, even in the Holy City, to bear part in the joyful ceremonial; how that they buried her with fitting rites; how that the third day, when they came to the tomb, they found it empty, and angelic choirs with their glad voices were heard singing day and night the glories of their risen Queen. But, however we feel towards the details of this history (*nor is there anything in it which will be unwelcome or difficult to piety*), so much *cannot be doubted,* from the consent of the whole Catholic world and the revelations made to holy souls, that, as is befitting, she is, soul and body, with her Son and God in heaven, and that we have to celebrate, not only her death, but her Assumption."—(Discourses to Mixed Congregations.)

The Church then, we submit, teaches infallibly the doctrine of the Assumption: yet she does not teach it as *of faith;* its denial would be (we venture to think) theologically unsound, but certainly it would not be heretical. A Catholic then has no call to maintain, that the Apostles actually taught the doctrine; but only that they taught premisses, from which it legitimately results. Dr. Pusey is pained indeed by the

reflection, that at some future time it may possibly be defined as of faith; and Suarez tells us that no Catholic in his day even doubted of this possibility.* But as there is no thought at present of any such definition, we need not discuss the question before it practically arises. All then that would here remain for us to do, would be to meet the objections against the doctrine raised by Dr. Pusey, whether from Scripture or from Antiquity. But he raises none such. He merely (p. 150) calls it a "bold conception"; and recites, without attempting to answer them, such arguments in its favour as we have quoted above from F. Newman.†

The body of Mary then so far enjoys the same privilege with the body of Jesus, that it has never been permitted to see corruption. Some remarks however of Dr. Pusey, in p. 171, induce us to protest against an accusation there contained. For he alleges that the Church encourages those, who press to a truly monstrous extent this similarity of circumstance, between the Blessed Virgin's body and her Son's. A young ecclesiastic, named Oswald, went the extravagant length of maintaining that Mary's body—and by concomitance therefore her person—are co-present with our Lord's in the Eucharist. Oswald's work was promptly put on the Index, and the author "laudably

* De Incarnatione, tom. ii. d. 3, s. 6, "Nullus dubitat quin tandem possint definiri."

† [An article on the Assumption appeared in the "Dublin Review" of October 1870, which to me seems very complete and satisfactory.]

submitted himself": but long before his time, as appears from a statement of Benedict XIV.'s which we shall presently cite, the same tenet had been condemned by ecclesiastical authority. The instinct of a good Catholic would have anticipated this condemnation. From Oswald's tenet two consequences immediately follow: viz., (1) that in Communion Catholics receive Mary as well as Christ; and (2) that in the very act of worshipping the Sacred Host, they should pay the homage of hyperdulia to the former as well as of latria to the latter. We have not a syllable to say then in behalf of so strange a notion, as that our Lady's body, or any part of it, is co-present in the Eucharist. No one approved writer has ever approached to any such language; nor has Dr. Pusey the slightest vestige of foundation for supposing, that the Church has been slow or neglectful in repressing it wherever it may have appeared. It is really unworthy of him to lay stress (p. 169, note) on "the authority of one staying at Rome," in regard to "a belief existing among the poorer people there"; without giving his opponents any means whatever of encountering and grappling with so shadowy and indefinite a statement.

The fact is, that Dr. Pusey has confused this tenet with another which differs from it in every relevant particular. Various Catholics have held, that a certain portion of matter, which *once* belonged to the Blessed Virgin, *now* belongs unchanged to her Son; and is therefore of course present in the Eucharist. To this F. Faber apparently inclines, who cites in its behalf a

vision of S. Ignatius. Either this or some similar tenet was accepted, as Dr. Pusey's quotations evince, by Cornelius à Lapide; by Salazar, who also quotes S. Ignatius; and probably by several others—by Suarez certainly for one ("de Mysteriis, d. i., s. ii. 2)—whom Dr. Pusey has not seen.* But the radical distinction between this tenet and the preceding is manifest from the fact, that this latter does not tend ever so remotely to the two practical consequences which we deduced above from the former.† And F. Newman (pp. 494–6)

* Mary of Agreda is one of those who held this. She mentions "illam partem Carnis et Sanguinis quæ in Isto Sacramento est, sicuti de meis visceribus illam *accepit* Sanctissimus Filius meus." —(Mystica Civitas, p. 3, n. 117.) In the Analecta Juris Pontificii, t. 6, pp. 2075, 2117, 2154, some criticisms of this chapter are quoted, which, as it seems to us, do not represent this part of her doctrine quite fairly. It is true that she counsels a special genuflection in honour of this particular portion of flesh; but (as every one may see who reads the chapter) it is not the worship of hyperdulia as to Mary, but the worship of latria as to Christ, which she considers its due.

† À Lapide says, as quoted by Dr. Pusey himself, "that flesh of Christ, before it was detached, *was* the own flesh of the Blessed Virgin." Salazar adopts S. Ignatius's view, that as, according to Aristotle, the flesh of mother and son is one and the same, in receiving Christ's flesh we receive His Mother's. But of course neither S. Ignatius nor any one else ever thought that the same flesh belongs *at the same time* to mother and son; and S. Ignatius therefore cannot by possibility have meant anything more extreme than what we state in the text. And so Salazar concludes "Eucharistia . . . . *modo jam insinuato*, Deiparæ carnem et sanguinem *quodammodo* includit." Mr. Rhodes has done excellent service (see "Weekly Register" of Aug. 11, 1866) in calling attention to F. Faber's most valuable and thoughtful remarks in his work on the Blessed Sacrament, pp. 514—516.

has very opportunely cited a passage from Lambertini's (Benedict XIV.'s) work on the canonization of Saints, in which that theologian states that the doctrine to which Dr. Pusey objects has been authoritatively condemned as "erroneous, dangerous, and scandalous."*

V.

We have now considered (1) the Blessed Virgin's exemption from original sin; and (2) her Assumption. We proceed lastly to that body of doctrine, which underlies the Marian devotion practically inculcated on Catholics by the Ecclesia Docens. We are as far as possible from wishing to underrate, for controversial purposes, the extent and prominence of that devotion. On the contrary, we hold that the Church regards the habitual and intimate thought and remembrance of the Most Holy Virgin, as an invaluable means of grace, and as giving extraordinary help to the true love of her Son.† Dr. Pusey, on his side,

* [In my original article I occupied a page or so with considering the *domestic* question intimated in the text. But I see no advantage to be gained by reprinting this.]

† What can be stronger than the practical exhortation, with which Pius IX. concludes his definition of the Immaculate Conception? Dr. Pusey serviceably quotes it in p. 180; but we substitute our own italics for his :—"Let all the sons of the Catholic Church, most dear to us, hear these our words, and with a yet more ardent zeal of piety, religion, and love, continue to worship, invoke, pray, the most blessed Mother of God, the Virgin Mary, conceived without original stain, and *to flee unto this most sweet Mother of mercy and grace, in all perils, distresses, necessities, and doubtful and anxious circumstances.* For nothing is to be feared,

denounces such devotion as quasi-idolatry, and as miserably obscuring the thought of God; while he denounces also the doctrine on which that devotion is built, as contrary to the teaching of Scripture and Antiquity. The former of these two objections we considered at length in our last number: it is our present business to consider the latter. In our last number [see pp. 5, 6 of the present volume] we mentioned certain doctrines, which appear to us manifestly implied in the devotion to our Blessed Lady, as practically inculcated by the Church; and we need not here repeat the enumeration. Dr. Pusey will be the last to deny, that such doctrines as these are practically and magisterially taught by the Roman Catholic Church. Since therefore, as we have already argued, the Church is *infallible* in her magisterium, it follows that these doctrines are infallibly true.* At the same time let it be carefully

nothing despaired of, when she is the Captain, she the Author, she propitious, she protecting, who, bearing a motherly mind towards us, and *having in hand the affairs of our salvation, is anxious about the whole human race;* and having been made by the Lord Queen of heaven and earth, and exalted above all the orders of Angels and Saints, standing at the Right Hand of her Only-begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ, does by her Mother's prayers most potently impetrate, and find what she seeks, and cannot be frustrated."

* In p. lxxvii. of his Introductory Essay, F. Harper has some admirable remarks on the authority of the Church's practical teaching. "It is precisely this practical system—this universal conviction—this development of the Tridentine Canons, as Dr. Pusey means it,—which is *the expression or rather actuation of the Church's present indwelling vitality.* Dead ideas alone can be

observed, that the Church does not teach this body of doctrine as *de fide*, though she teaches it with infallible authority. We are therefore in no way called on to maintain that the Apostles actually inculcated it; but only that they inculcated principles, from which it is legitimately deduced. What Dr. Pusey then has to do—if he would effect anything whatever to his purpose—is to show that the Apostles did *not* inculcate principles, from which the existent body of Catholic Marian doctrine is legitimately deduced. We hold with full certitude that they did inculcate such principles; and the ground of our certitude is the existent practical teaching of the infallible Church. On what ground does he profess to establish the *opposite* conclusion? On the ground of Scripture and Antiquity. It is no business of ours to *prove* Catholic doctrine by direct appeal to Scripture and Antiquity. We appeal to Scripture and Antiquity, as proving the infallibility of the ever-living Church; and we appeal to the infallibility of the ever-living Church, as proving the truth of those doctrines concerning Mary which the

hidden up in manuscript; living ideas grow, and show fruit. It is precisely *in and through this vast practical system*—in proportion as it is universal—that the Holy Ghost is working, directing, *leading the mind of the Church by degrees into all the truth.* Mere formulæ—mere written definitions, by themselves—are bodies that have either lost animation, or are waiting for it. In the Church they are *the expression of her perfected consciousness*, on the particular subject of that revealed dogma about which they treat. They live in her spirit, and grow with her growth. Like all things else that have an undecaying life, *they can never decrease, but must ever increase.*"

living Church practically teaches. But Dr. Pusey does appeal directly to Scripture and Antiquity; and what he has to do (if he can) is to disprove the Catholic doctrines in question *by means* of this direct appeal. As a fact he appeals both to the language and to the silence both of Scripture and of Antiquity.

But now firstly as to the *language* of Scripture. He does not and he cannot adduce a single text, which says that the merits of Mary are *not* incomparably greater than those of any other created person; or that she does *not* occupy a place in heaven incomparably nearer to her Son than any other; or that she ever committed sin: in one word he cannot adduce a single text, which contradicts any one of the Marian doctrines we have recited. His appeal is not really to the *language* of Scripture, but to its *silence* or its supposed *implication*. And the first argument we adduce against him shall be to point out that—so far from the Scriptures being *silent* on Mary's extraordinary prominence in the Christian scheme—they have used language of quite startling emphasis to *express* that prominence. This then will be our most appropriate place, for considering more carefully than we have yet done, the Protevangel of Genesis: for we believe that not Protestants only, but a large number of Catholics, have never sufficiently weighed the intense significance of this prophecy. We will here put it down in full. "Inimicitias ponam inter te et Mulierem, et semen tuum et semen illius": Ipse "conteret caput tuum, et tu insidiaberis calcaneo ejus" (Gen. iii. 15).* Such was

* In the latter clause we have agreed with Dr. Pusey, in giving

the first promise of Redemption, given by God in the very moment of pronouncing doom. Who is the Woman here spoken of? Both F. Newman and F. Harper assure us, that the Fathers understood Mary as the Woman; and Dr. Pusey also himself is of the same mind. But in fact we do not see how any other sense can be even suggested. The Woman is either Mary or Eve. But if she were Eve, who are "the Woman's seed"? "Her carnal posterity" of course; i.e. the mass of mankind, the world. Either then you must hold, that God placed an eternal enmity between the devil and the world—a somewhat astounding hypothesis to the devout Christian—or else you must look to Mary as the prophesied Woman. It should further be added, as F. Newman points out, that there is S. Paul's inspired authority for that parallelism between Adam and Christ, which vividly suggests the further parallelism between Eve and Mary.

Who are Satan's "seed"? All evil spirits and evil men; those who followed his evil example; those who constitute that kingdom of which, in some sense, he is the ruler. So far there can be no second opinion.

Whom then are we to understand by Mary's "seed"? In the first place undoubtedly, her Divine Son; for to Him reference is immediately made as to one already mentioned—"Ipse." But we must in-

the masculine reading "Ipse" as more probably the true one. See F. Harper's overwhelming reply to Dr. Pusey, from p. 339 to p. 350, on the argument which the latter attempts to draw from this masculine reading.

clude others besides Him, or else the latter part of the first clause will not be duly opposed to the former. If Satan's seed include all evil angels and evil men, then Mary's seed must at all events include all good men.

Two parties then are mentioned by God, between whom He will place irreconcilable "enmities": these are the respective parties of evil and good; they who fight under the respective banners of the devil and of God. The one party, receiving its name in the prophecy from Satan, includes all evil angels and evil men. The other party, receiving its name in the prophecy from Mary, includes, firstly, the Incarnate God; and secondly, all good men. Montfort has horrified Dr. Pusey, by drawing out from this prophecy what is only a very small part of its full purport. "God has never made or formed but one enmity; but it is an irreconcilable one, which shall endure and develop even unto the end. It is between Mary, His worthy Mother, and the devil; between the children and the servants of Mary, and the children and instruments of Lucifer." (Eirenicon, p. 168.) If even this statement appears to Protestants so extravagant, what would they have said had Montfort, or some other "Marian" writer, done fuller justice to the words of Almighty God? We mentioned in our last number [pp. 95—97 of this volume] how shocked is Dr. Pusey, by Montfort speaking of "souls which are born of God and of Mary." But what if Montfort had expressed that which God expresses in this prophecy? if he had pointed to Mary, as the one predicted enemy of Satan; to Christ

and good Christians, as jointly constituting her seed; to Christ and good Christians as agreeing with each other in this, that He and they are alike born of God and of Mary? We see not how the following conclusion can be evaded. If the scene recorded in Genesis were a real announcement of Redemption, then the whole body of Protestants with Dr. Pusey at their head denounce, as corrupt and anti-Christian, that very doctrine, which God Himself revealed as the foundation of Christian hope. His first promise of a Redeemer was (as it were) imbedded in His promise of a Co-Redemptress.

From the first book of Scripture we move on to the last, the Apocalypse. There has never been written, we think, a more masterly and more faultless specimen of Scriptural exegesis, than F. Newman's application of Apoc. xii. 1—6 to our Blessed Lady (pp. 407—411). Such, then, was S. John's view of his sovereign Mistress and tenderly loved Mother: "a Woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet." What words can be more significant, as expressing a place at the very summit of creation? And in this vision again, as in the prophecy of Genesis, Satan contends directly against her, and but indirectly against her Son. Surely nothing less can be inferred from such glowing words, than that, apart from her Son "Who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron" (ver. 5), she possessed quite incomparably the noblest and most elevated place in His Kingdom. But His Kingdom is the Kingdom of grace, and its end the sanctification and salvation of souls. Hence Mary, next to her Son,

possesses incomparably the noblest and most elevated place in sanctifying and saving souls.

We have quoted from the beginning, and from the end, of Scripture. We now turn to that intermediate portion of it, the four Gospels, where we should naturally expect the most direct testimonies concerning her office and prerogatives. It is the universal conviction, we believe, of Protestants, that so far as the Gospels speak of her at all, it is invariably in a tone of disparagement. Nothing more shows the blindness of traditional prejudice than such a mistake; but before entering on individual passages, we will dwell on the general fact of Christ's relations to her, as exhibited in the Gospel narrative.

And first, it continually escapes notice, how truly remarkable it is that He had a Mother at all. There would have been no greater miracle than was in fact wrought (rather indeed a less one), had He appeared at once on earth, e. g. as an infant; and had some pious woman been commissioned by God to foster Him in His earlier years. Let us suppose that the two facts became known to us successively. Firstly, we hear that God has become Incarnate for our sins: and when we have had time to ponder duly on this, we learn the further fact, that He has been borne for nine months in the womb of a Virgin Mother.* Our immediate impression would assuredly be, that this

* The "Te Deum" commemorates these mercies as separate. "Tu ad liberandum suscepturus hominem, non horruisti Virginis uterum."

Mother is associated with Him in His redeeming office by some most close and mysterious union.

Again, it in no respect follows from the mere fact of His having a Mother, that she should have been privileged with such unspeakable familiarity of thought and communion with Him. She might have died, e. g., soon after His birth. How different was the fact! Of the thirty-three years which He passed on earth, thirty were passed in the closest and most unreserved intercourse, first with Mary and Joseph, afterwards with Mary alone. The Apostles were taught by Him collectively and (as one may say) formally; with none of them is He represented as cultivating that uninterrupted domestic intimacy, which characterized His relations with His Mother and His foster-father. That Catholic instinct, which places S. Joseph next to the Blessed Virgin in heaven and as raised far above all other Saints, is but the legitimate inference from what Scripture declares.

In considering next those individual facts which illustrate Mary's high prerogatives, we come first to the angelic salutation: "χαῖρε κεχαριτωμένη," "Ave gratiâ plena." Can any instance be named of a Divine message brought to some creature, in which the salutation is nearly so honourable or so indicative of dignity?

(2.) Immediately after the Annunciation, she went to visit Elizabeth. We know not whether Protestants in general accept the Catholic belief, that S. John Baptist was cleansed from original sin, at the moment when he "leaped" in Elizabeth's womb; but

Dr. Pusey undoubtedly accepts it. He admits then, that the first miracle wrought by our Lord was wrought throught His Mother's mediation; and that the precise moment chosen for its accomplishment, was when the voice of Mary's salutation sounded in Elizabeth's ears.

(3.) Who was Elizabeth? "Among the sons of women, no greater hath arisen than John Baptist." Elizabeth was chosen to be his mother, and that by a certain miracle. Great was she then undoubtedly in office and in dignity; yet she seemed penetrated with a sense of our Lady's singular condescension in coming to visit her. "*Whence is this to me,* that the Mother of my Lord should come to me?" And this speech is the more remarkable, because God Incarnate was also present at the same moment; and yet Elizabeth speaks explicitly, not of His visit, but of His Mother's.

(4.) The shepherds of Bethlehem, the Magi from the East, came to adore the newly-born God. They found Him resting in His Mother's arms, as on His appointed throne. They anticipated that very form of worship, which Catholics have retained and Protestants rejected. "It was one of her greatnesses and benedictions, that her Son thought fit to manifest Himself in an age and condition, which obliged Him to manifest her with Him."*

(5.) The Incarnate God "was subject to" Mary and Joseph (Luke ii. 51). We dwelt on this statement

* Quoted from the Cardinal de Bérulle by Nicolas, "Plan Divin," vol. ii. p. 14.

in our last number.* Its extraordinary force is manifest, from the horror and indignation expressed by Protestants, when later Catholic writers use the very same phrase.

(6.) Then, as His first miracle had been performed through her mediation, His first *public* miracle was performed at Cana through her intercession.

(7.) That Mary, at all events, was a tender and affectionate Mother, no Protestants have ventured to deny; nor consequently that the contemplation of her Son, dying in unimaginable Agony, was the keenest of sufferings. Yet she placed herself at the very foot of the Cross, where she could most keenly taste that suffering and drink the cup to its very dregs. Surely in no other way can you do justice to the spirit and significance of this fact, unless you suppose, with Catholics, that she was thereby fulfilling to the very last her august office of Co-Redemptress; and filling the measure of that com-passion, which availed congruously to the sanctification and salvation of mankind.

(8.) Nor must the remarkable phrase "Mulier" be forgotten, twice addressed to her by her Son. It recalls at once the "inimicitias inter serpentem et *Mulierem*"; and is strikingly analogous to our Lord's own title, "The Son of Man"—"The Seed of the Woman."

In a future article† we will dwell on these points at greater length; and to the same article we remit a

* [See pp. 73—77 of this volume.]

† [That which stands next in the present volume.]

consideration of certain passages in the Gospels, on which Protestants love to insist.

But Protestants ask two further questions, which require an answer. Firstly, they ask why in the Gospels there is so little mention of Mary: and secondly, why in the Epistles the faithful are never urged to her invocation. And there is one remark at all events, which has been often made, and which is equally applicable in the case of both objections. When there is question of a *man's* writing, a very cogent argument may often be drawn from his *silence* on this or that particular; because we may be indefinitely acquainted with all the various motives which can conceivably actuate him. But nothing can be more precarious than such an argument in case of *God's* Word; since He may have innumerable reasons, unknown to us and unsuspected. Even though we were obliged to confess ourselves incapable of explaining the silence of Scripture, the objection drawn from that silence would still be worth very little.

Now first as to the Gospels. Putting aside altogether the case of Our Lady, the most cursory view of them will show that they are pervaded by a certain mysterious law of silence. Nothing whatever is recorded of our Blessed Lord's life in Egypt; only one incident is told, from His beginning to live at Nazareth down to the commencement of His public ministry; hardly anything of His most momentous communications with the Apostolic college during the great Forty Days. Will Protestants say then, that He neither spoke nor acted during those long intervals? or that

the acts and speeches of God Incarnate were trivial and insignificant? If they cannot say either of these things, let them cease to build on the silence of Scripture concerning His Blessed Mother.

Yet if the task be done with sobriety and reverence, it cannot but be profitable to examine this very remarkable silence. And on commencing this examination, there are two different difficulties which present themselves. (1.) Why do we hear so little concerning that portion of her life, which was spent apart from her Son, before His Incarnation and after His Ascension? (2.) Why do we know so little of those most momentous colloquies, which must have proceeded between Jesus and Mary during the thirty years, throughout which their intercourse was so close and uninterrupted?

In answer to the former inquiry, let it be asked what was the place which Mary was intended to hold, in the spiritual life of an interior Christian. He is to cultivate the habitual and most intimate thought of her: and yet that thought is to be subordinate and ministrative to the central and paramount thought of her Son and her God. Now let that further be borne in mind, which we urged in our last number.* What is meant when one says that each different Saint has a *character* of his own? S. Paul e. g. had his own very pronounced character; S. Peter his; and so of the rest. It must mean at all events, that certain qualities very perceptibly and prominently predominated over the rest. Now does not this further imply that there was a certain want of complete harmony?

* [See pp. 35–6 of the present volume.]

a certain imperfection of temperament? On the other hand, our Saviour, as exhibited in the Gospels, has no "character"; no one quality predominates unduly over any other; He is the very image of the Infinitely Perfect God. In like manner Mary has no special "character" of her own, any more than her Son has; she is the "Speculum Justitiæ"; the faultless mirror of complete and harmonious sanctity. This being so, let us consider what must have resulted, had a series of her separate acts and words been reported, with the same distinctness of detail wherewith the Gospels recount her Son's. Instead of His minister, she would have been His rival. Contrast e.g. the case of S. Paul. We know almost as much of his life and his personal characteristics as of Christ's; yet the notion is preposterous, of there being the slightest danger of one rivalling the other. Why so? Because S. Paul's character is so unmistakably human; so absolutely heterogeneous from his Master's. But, on the other hand, if Mary be what Catholics believe, in what single respect would her words and actions have differed from her Son's, as regards the practical impression they would have made on our mind? Not more, we will venture to say, than our Lord, as exhibited by S. Luke, differs from our Lord as exhibited by S. John. The result (unless some miracle were wrought to counteract it) must have been disastrous. On the other hand, as the matter has in fact been appointed, we cannot fix our thoughts on her earnestly and in detail, without being led on to contemplate her Son. Her joys, as contemplated by Catholics, were

in His Presence; her dolours in His Passion; her exaltation in His Resurrection and Ascension.

But it will be replied, and truly, that this argument cannot apply to the innumerable colloquies between Jesus and Mary; for that in *them* the latter's subordination would be always emphatically manifested. Here then we introduce a different consideration altogether. Putting aside for the moment our Lady, we will return to the great Forty Days, during which He "appeared to" the Apostles "and *spake concerning the Kingdom of God*" (Acts. i. 3). Now if you consider that the Apostles' eyes were now (as one may say) opened; that the Atonement was accomplished; that the miracle of the Resurrection had been visibly wrought; that our Lord's final departure was at hand; it is evident that the instructions he then gave must have been of an incomparably more elevated and sublime character, than those of the earlier period. And yet no part of them is recorded. How do Protestants explain this? There is one most obvious answer to be given. From the very fact that those instructions were so mystical, so unearthly, so transcendental, they would be unintelligible to ordinary readers; and, indeed, in all probability would be open to most injurious misapprehension. It was the Apostles' business, as time went on, to translate them, as it were, into the language of ordinary men; and accommodate to the captus of each individual disciple the marvels learned from their Risen Saviour.

But if the discourses addressed to Apostles were so raised above ordinary apprehension, what shall be

said of His intimate and familiar colloquies with Mary and Joseph? Extravagant is the very thought of taking them down in a record and exhibiting them to the world, if Mary and Joseph be really such as Catholics believe them. As well might you think of unfolding to mortal men the mutual conversation of Angels in heaven.

Then it is firmly held by all Catholics, that our Risen Lord's first appearance was to His Mother; and Protestants taunt us with the silence of Scripture on this interview. Yet consider what that interview was. The Redeemer and the Co-Redemptress meeting for the first time, after Redemption has been accomplished; the Mother enjoying her Son's presence, on the first occasion of her life when she could think of Him with unmixed joy. What profanation in the very thought of putting into words the ineffable sweetness, tenderness, peacefulness, of that unparalleled scene!

You are led then, à priori, to expect just what in fact you find: that it is our Lord's public life, and that alone, which shall be recorded in detail and with abundant particulars. What He then said and did, was made level to the apprehension of ordinary men. "Blessed were their eyes, for they saw; and their ears, for they heard": and of the same blessedness Christians are made partakers in every age, by studying the record of what then took place.

We consider then, that the silence of the Gospels not only gives no advantage to Protestants against the Church, but, on the contrary, gives the Church

an extremely strong argument against Protestants. On the Catholic hypothesis, the whole thing is most intelligible; but what explanation of the fact will a Protestant give? He will maintain, we suppose, that so little is recorded concerning Mary, because she said and did so little which *deserves* record. A strange view concerning her who uttered the "Magnificat"! But let us grant it him for argument's sake: how will he explain the silence of Scripture, not concerning Mary, but concerning her Son? concerning all His marvellous actions and words, during thirty years out of thirty-three?

We next proceed to the silence of the Acts and Epistles on the invocation of Mary. "If devotion to the Blessed Virgin," asks Dr. Pusey, "were so essential to salvation, how could it be that God, in His last and final revelation of Himself, is so wholly silent about it?" (p. 119). Well, at all events there could have been no devotion to her (in the present sense) before her Assumption; and Dr. Pusey should have considered therefore, how many books of Scripture were written before that event. Still it is quite certain, that neither Christ nor His Apostles are recorded in Scripture as having in any way publicly proclaimed her singular pre-eminence among redeemed souls; and this might undoubtedly have been done before her Assumption no less than after it. For a moment however, as before, we will put aside the particular question of our Lady, and consider a broader aspect of the case.

The one central doctrine of the Gospel is the

Incarnation. Moreover, there is no doctrine which is more certainly and undeniably contained in Scripture. Those who study carefully the New Testament text, will be amazed to find how constantly, and in how surprising a variety of ways, this truth is implied and wrought as it were into the context. Yet, on the other hand, you may see on the surface that it is very far more often *implied* than *expressed*. There are a small number of well-known texts which do express it. But our Blessed Lord Himself speaks of "Thee, the Only True God, and Jesus Christ Whom Thou hast sent"; as though the latter were not "the Only True God": and it is far the more common practice of the New Testament writers to speak similarly. A still more remarkable circumstance is this. Since the Incarnation is the central doctrine of the Gospel, it follows that the one spiritual and devotional practice, characteristic of Christianity, is *the addressing latria to Christ*. Now Protestants dwell with such emphasis on the silence of Scripture concerning the invocation of Mary, that one would expect to find the New Testament in every page counselling or exhibiting *prayer to Christ*. But what is the fact? Of course, both the few texts which distinctly declare our Lord's Divine Personality, and the innumerable texts which imply it, alike *imply* that He is suitably worshipped with latria. Again, it is the one legitimate sense of Heb. i. 6, that God proposed Him to the Angels as so to be worshipped. Then S. Stephen says, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit"; and S. Paul, "Lord, what wouldest Thou have me to do?": but they were both at the time seeing Jesus

with their bodily eyes. (Acts vii. 55, 58, 59; ix. 6.) The question we ask is this. *In how many passages of Scripture is prayer to Christ Invisible either practised or expressly counselled?* In Acts i. 24, where prayer is offered to "the Lord" before election of the new Apostle, "the Lord" may very probably be Christ. Again in 2 Cor. xii. 8, where S. Paul recounts his having prayed against the "stimulus carnis," the following verse makes it pretty clear that Christ is intended: but then, as He immediately answers, it would seem that He was visibly present with S. Paul on each occasion. And how many other such passages are to be found? We will not venture to assert a negative; but we will at least beg Dr. Pusey to supply a list of such texts. It is quite certain at all events, that they are extremely few; while it is equally certain, as we have said, that such prayer is the one characteristic worship of Christianity. Let him explain to us the reason of this truly remarkable silence; and we will assuredly explain to him the silence, which is not one whit more remarkable, preserved by Scripture on the invocation of Mary.

We have already observed, that to argue from the silence of *God's* Word is a most precarious course; and if we could assign no reason whatever for the above phenomenon, such a fact would disturb us very little. Petavius however* throws out some such suggestion as the following; though at the fag end of an article devoted to a different subject, we can, of

* We have been unable at the moment to recover our reference.

course, attempt no more than a most brief indication of his view. Consider the singularly difficult task to be encountered by the Apostolic Church. Her converts had either been Jews or Polytheists; while she had to inculcate the doctrine of a Trinity. There was evidently the greatest danger lest, on the one hand, Polytheists might misapprehend such a doctrine as yielding some sanction to their ancient blasphemies; and lest Jews, on the other hand, whose greatest glory has been a jealous upholding of Monotheism, might be alarmed and repelled by fancying that this fundamental verity was denied. The success of her efforts in overcoming this difficulty was so signal, that subsequent Christians are tempted to overlook its existence; but on reflection you will find that you can hardly exaggerate its seriousness. By what means did the Apostles encounter it? On the one hand, they really taught that Christ is the Father's True and Substantial Son; a truth which includes, of course, really His Divine Personality. But on the other hand, they did not attempt a full and exhaustive analysis of this doctrine; and still less (which is our immediate point) did they proceed to give it its due and legitimate shape and proportion, in the daily and habitual worship of Christians. That they themselves abounded in prayer to Jesus, no Trinitarian will doubt; but neither for ourselves do we doubt that, from the moment of Mary's Assumption, they abounded also in prayer to Mary. What we are here saying is merely, that there is hardly one iota more of Scriptural evidence for the former of these facts than for the latter.

Now, if Dr. Pusey will not accept this explanation, we have a right to call on him either to substitute some other, or else to withdraw that argument against the Catholic dovotion to Mary which we are here encountering. But if he do accept such an explanation, he must see at once that whatever assistance it may give him in his controversy with Unitarians, it gives far greater assistance to the Catholic in his controversy with Anglicans. If in the case of these neophytes there was serious danger to the purity of their faith, by their being called on habitually to worship the Eternal Son of God;—how immeasurably greater, by their being counselled habitually to worship a creature! It was, of course, absolutely necessary for the whole body of heathen reminiscences to become effaced, before Christians could be safely initiated into the fulness and sweetness of Marian devotion. We fully concede then to Dr. Pusey's above-cited objection, that the early converts endured a very great spiritual privation, in that their direct worship of Jesus was so sparing; and in that there was apparently no direct worship of Mary at all. But we say that this privation, however deplorable, was under circumstances inevitable. Every age has its own peculiar blessings, and its own peculiar disadvantages. God adjusts His providence and His grace to the circumstances of each period; nor will Dr. Pusey advance one step towards gaining the privileges of the First Century, because he may choose thanklessly to throw away those of the Nineteenth.

The same consideration will account for the Queen of the Apostles not having appeared during her earthly

life on the public ecclesiastical scene. It is firmly held by Catholics, that during this period she had supreme influence over the Apostolic counsels;* but it was impossible, without the greatest danger, that the general body of converts should be made acquainted with her office of Co-Redemptress. And on similar grounds, the fact is most easily intelligible, which we admitted in the early part of this article; viz., that the Apostolic teaching of her Immaculate Conception, though actual, was unemphatic.

VI.

We have now, therefore, sufficiently considered (1) the language, and (2) the silence of Scripture, concerning the most holy Virgin. Our next argument was to have been on the language of Antiquity; but what has been said on this head in the earlier part of our article, will abundantly suffice.

Lastly then we are to speak on the silence of Antiquity. And we very readily admit at starting, that many centuries elapsed, before the invocation of Mary assumed a regular and systematic shape, at all parallel to that which now prevails. But, firstly, so far as regards the ante-Nicene period, it is a very grave and intricate question, how far direct prayer to *our Lord* was at that time common. The present writer has not the requisite knowledge for any precise statement

* F. Newman refers with assent to this, where he implies (p. 411), that the silence of the New Testament on our Lady may perchance be ascribed to her own humility, and to her influence with the Scripture writers.

of facts on this matter; but we may usefully draw attention to some remarks made a few years ago in the "Home and Foreign Review." That Review, with all its remarkable ability, was often in the habit of making far too sweeping assertions; and the article, from which we are about to quote, shows to our mind more than one indication of unsound doctrine. By all means therefore, let the following statement be examined by learned men: we only give it for what it may be worth. The author is replying to a Protestant controversialist, who thus speaks of devotion to our Lady:—"There is nothing of the sort in Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, that is in the Second Century. There is nothing of the sort in Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Cyprian, Methodius, Lactantius, that is in the Third Century." The author of the article replies in effect, that the same identical statement might be made with equal truth concerning "the invocation of Christ as Almighty God."* It is perfectly certain indeed, that the ante-Nicene Fathers held truly and sincerely the revealed doctrine on our Lord's Divine Personality: but it is no less certain that they held it with more or less imperfection and inaccuracy of analysis, and without fully carrying it out to its legitimate devotional position. "It required century after century," says F. Newman, "to *spread out* the doctrine *in its fulness*, and to imprint it energetically on *the worship and practice* of the Catholic people, as well as on their faith. Athanasius was the first

* "Home and Foreign Review" for April, 1864, pp. 658–9.

and great teacher of it." Now it is very plain that the Holy Ghost could never have permitted any large prevalence of devotion to Mary, until the fundamental doctrine of the Incarnation was adequately impressed on the mind of Christians; because deplorable confusion must have thence resulted. But that doctrine once placed in clearest and fullest light, there was an opening quite different in kind from any which had hitherto existed, for the sustained and habitual worship of our great Co-Redemptress. This has nowhere, we think, been so well explained, as by F. Newman in his "Essay on Development:"—

"The Arian controversy opened a question which it did not settle. It discovered a new sphere, if we may so speak, in the realms of light, to which the Church had not yet assigned its inhabitant. . . .

The Nicene Council recognised the eventful principle, that, while we believe and profess any being to be a creature, such a being is really no God to us, though honoured by us with whatever high titles and with whatever homage. Arius or Asterius did all but confess that Christ was the Almighty; *they said much more than S. Bernard or S. Alphonso have since said of Mary:* yet they left Him a creature and were found wanting. Thus there was 'a wonder in heaven:' a throne was seen, far above all created powers, mediatorial, intercessory; a title archetypal; a crown bright as the morning star; a glory issuing from the Eternal Throne; robes pure as the heavens; and a sceptre over all; and who was the predestined heir of that Majesty? . . .

The vision is found in the Apocalypse: a Woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars. *The*

votaries of Mary do not exceed the true faith, unless the blasphemers of her Son came up to it. The Church of Rome is not idolatrous, unless Arianism is orthodoxy."

We must maintain then most confidently, that the particular form, assumed by devotion to Mary in early times, is in no respect whatever a measure of its legitimate scope and extent. Let Dr. Pusey consider the following fact. It was not till the mediæval period, that detailed lives of our Lord came into circulation; and that there fully existed what we now call devotion to the Passion. Yet Dr. Pusey will be forward in admitting, that such developments as these were intended by God from the very first. He cannot therefore object on à priori grounds to the opinion, that a similar development was equally intended on the honours paid to Mary. Our positive reason of course for firmly holding this, is the Church's infallibility in her practical magisterium. We are now only urging, that the comparative silence of Antiquity constitutes no kind of argument, against the truth of what Holy Church now infallibly teaches. The worship of Mary, for obvious reasons, would be both far later in starting, and far later in arriving at maturity, than the worship of Christ; nor has Dr. Pusey therefore any right to be astonished at Montfort's and Faber's opinion, that even yet it is far from having exhausted its due and legitimate growth. Nor must it be forgotten, that (as we urged in our last number) this devotion itself has powerfully reacted on the higher worship, and has most efficaciously assisted Catholics to realize in their

heart and imagination the doctrine of the Incarnation. By worshipping Mary as Christ's Mother, they can never forget that He is man; by constantly approaching Him through her mediation, they can never forget that He is God.

VII.

To conclude. Pius IX. (as we have seen) exhorts the faithful to "flee," "with a yet more ardent zeal," "unto this sweet Mother of mercy and grace, in all perils, distresses, and necessities." The worship of Mary may of course, as we said in our last number, be imaginably wrong in *kind*: but every one would infer from such words as the above, that it cannot possibly exceed in *degree;* that it cannot too intimately pervade our whole habits of thought, and our whole interior life. And since the Ecclesia Docens is our one infallible guide to heaven, we know with infallible certainty, both that the doctrines which underlie this devotion are true, and that the devotion itself, in the shape sanctioned by the Church, cannot be too heartily and perseveringly practised. Here then is a matter at issue between Catholics and Anglicans, which no one on either side can fairly deny to be of great importance. Dr. Pusey, as Anglican champion, raises two chief classes of objection against the Church's teaching. Firstly, he maintains that it quenches love for Jesus and for God; to which we replied in our last number that, on the contrary, it tends in quite a

singular degree to feed that love, and to invest it with an otherwise untasted quality of tenderness and reality. Secondly, he contends that the Church's teaching on the matter is disproved by Scripture and Antiquity; and to this objection we have now replied. We have maintained that Scripture and Antiquity cannot be legitimately alleged against the worship of Mary, unless they can be legitimately alleged against the worship of Jesus; that there is no statement or fact adduced from them, which is not fully reconcilable with the Catholic theory; and that Scripture in its obvious sense points perhaps to an even fuller development of devotion to Mary, than has yet been reached.

And we have had peculiar pleasure in adopting F. Harper's admirable title, "Peace through the Truth," as expressing the true position of every good Catholic in this controversy. Hard indeed must be the heart, and unchristian the spirit, which does not yearn for religious "peace:" the only question that can be even raised on the matter, concerns the divinely appointed means of promoting it. We urge, in company with F. Harper, that God sanctions no method for forwarding "peace," which does not uphold the supreme authority of "the truth." The Apostles left with the Church a priceless Deposit of dogma. Devout Christians in every age have contemplated that dogma, both with the warmest affection of heart and the keenest investigation of intellect; and there have thus arisen two vast doctrinal developments, powerfully reacting on each other, the devotional and the scientific. The spotless purity of these developments

in all their fulness, so far as the Church has expressly or practically sanctioned them, is guaranteed by the promises of God, and secured by the watchful and unintermittent Agency of the Holy Ghost. It cannot therefore but be displeasing to God, if any Catholics, for the sake of conciliating externs, seek to disavow or explain away any part of what He has infallibly taught as true. For non-Catholics, the only path to Christian unity is the path of humble retractation and submission.* For Catholics, the only method of promoting peace is to exhibit, vindicate, recommend, the paramount claims of truth.

* To prevent misconception however of our meaning here, we will reprint a paragraph from our number for last April. "A candidate for reception," we said, "will perhaps speak thus: 'These constant prayers to Mary are quite external to my previous experience, and I shrink altogether from plunging into them headlong. Yet I see that the Church sanctions them, and I have no doubt, therefore, that they are pleasing to God. By degrees I shall probably understand and practise them myself.' To say the least, there is nothing reprehensible in this;" on the whole, indeed, it is probably the most healthy state of mind for a convert. "At the same time such a man, when once he has become a Catholic, will probably advance very far more speedily than he had thought possible, in sympathy even with the more extreme forms of Marian doctrine."

MARY IN THE GOSPELS.

Mary in the Gospels; or, Lectures on the History of Our Blessed Lady, as recorded by the Evangelists. By Rev. J. Spencer Northcote, D.D. London: Burns & Oates.

[April, 1867.]

I.

PROTESTANTS in general, we think, are far more prejudiced against Catholicity by negative than by positive arguments from Scripture; more by the *silence*, than by the *language*, of the Written Word. "If there were a Sacrifice of the Mass," they ask, "if there were a Purgatory, if there were an obligation of Sacramental Confession,—how is it imaginable that S. Paul, e. g., who enters with such detail into Christian doctrine and practice, should be so silent on these great matters?" It is therefore a cause to us of much regret, that our ordinary controversialists pay so little comparative attention to these negative arguments; and we hail with all the greater pleasure Dr. Northcote's most interesting volume, because it is precisely to this negative argument that he has mainly addressed himself. At starting, too, he displays one first-rate controversial quality: for no one can state with more ample and conscientious candour the objection to be met.

"It is said, then, that whereas other children of Adam are noticed by our Divine Redeemer in a way which has secured for them an everlasting renown, one alone stands buried in the darkest and almost impenetrable shade, and that one is Mary, His Mother. Of St. John the Baptist, Jesus says that he is something more than a prophet, and that there has not arisen a greater among those that are born of women; of Simon, the son of Jonas, He says that he is Peter, and upon this rock He will build His Church; of the Chananæan woman, that her faith is great; of the centurion, that He has not found such faith, not even in Israel; of Mary, the sister of Martha, that she has chosen the better part; of Magdalen, the woman that was a sinner, that, wherever the Gospel was preached (that is to say, throughout the whole world), there what she had done for Him should be told as a memorial of her. These all receive testimony of praise from the lips of our Divine Redeemer; but of the Virgin Mary, His own Mother, her whom all generations were to call blessed, He neither praises the faith nor the devotion; He neither proclaims her dignity nor promises her everlasting rewards; He is wholly silent concerning her. No, not wholly silent: she speaks to Him once on a very public occasion, and He answers, "Woman, what is to Me and to thee?" or, as some of you have been accustomed to hear it, "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" She desires to speak with Him again on another occasion, and he uses words which seem almost to disown the relationship between them: "Who is my Mother? and who are my brethren?" And yet once more, when a woman lifted up her voice from among the multitude to proclaim her praises, saying, "Blessed is the womb that bare Thee, and the paps which gave Thee suck," Jesus noticed it only to turn aside the praise from His Mother, and to extend the privilege by making it

common to all the disciples, saying, "Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the Word of God and keep it." (pp. 3–5.)

In meeting this plausible objection, our author by no means falls into the fault which besets so many controversialists; the fault of understating Catholic doctrine, in order the more easily to defend it. On the contrary—while he takes most laudable care to guard against misapprehension, and to make Protestants understand the real character and bearing of Catholic devotion to our Lady,—he does not shrink from any tenet which has been put forth by approved writers. He adopts (p. 60) S. Alphonsus's golden rule, that "no honour, no privilege (provided only that it be possible and lawful in a creature), can be thought extravagant and out of place in one who was deemed worthy to have a Son common to herself and the Eternal Father." He dwells earnestly (p. 340 and elsewhere) on the extremely prominent place which she holds in the Catholic's whole interior life; and throws back, indeed, a most forcible retort on Dr. Pusey. What are the sources to which that writer has recourse, when he would brand the Roman Catholic Church with a charge of quasi-idolatry? "The superstitions of the vulgar and the extravagances of theological writers." Well —asks Dr. Northcote in effect (p. 341)—what two classes of men can stand more widely apart than these? If *both* develop Catholic doctrine into so intense and pervasive a system of devotion to our Blessed Lady, does not this very fact imply that such development is legitimate?

As a suitable introduction to the direct theme of Dr. Northcote's work, we will quote one passage, which both in itself expresses a truth of fundamental importance, and exhibits also singular power and felicity of language.

"In these modern days (says our author) all the old heresies which once succeeded one another with rapidity yet distinctness, *are mixed in the minds of men pell-mell, and held (as it were) in solution in the world's atmosphere;* so that it is true to say of a great number of Christians, that to them our Divine Lord is a being of the imagination, which they paint to themselves, and, if forced, would put into words to others, rather by means of negations than by positive assertion. Instead of holding distinctly and positively, and with the firm assurance of Divine faith, that He is both God and man, and both in all perfection, they think of Him as God only when they find it inconvenient or difficult to think of Him as man, and they think of Him as man only when the sufferings and indignities inflicted upon Him make them wish to forget that he is God; thus *destroying Him, as it were, by means of His double nature, and holding Him in suspense between the two.* They never think of His actions, of His whole life, of everything He did and suffered, as having been done and suffered by one Person, who was at one and the same moment both God and man; but they divide and multiply Him, *thinking of Him as two Persons,* and attributing one class of His actions exclusively to His Humanity and the other to His Divinity." (pp. 51–2.)

It is this ignorance of true doctrine on the Incarnation, which lies at the bottom of ordinary Protestant objections to the Catholic worship of our Blessed Lady.

Nor is there any other way so effectual for preserving securely belief in the Incarnation, as an intimate union in one's thoughts of those two great Names, Jesus and Mary. By worshipping Mary as His Mother, one can never forget that He is Man; by constantly approaching Him through her mediation, one can never forget that He is God.

Dr. Northcote's subject, be it observed, is not "Mary in the Acts," or, "Mary in the Epistles," but "Mary in the Gospels;" to which should be added, though his title does not express it, "Mary in Prophecy." We will confine our own remarks then within the same limits. We have already treated the subject in October last; * and Dr. Northcote refers very kindly to our labours: though his own volume was completed long before our article appeared. Our present purpose is to join forces with Dr. Northcote; to enlarge the view we placed before our readers in October, by help of the many most valuable suggestions which our author supplies. Nor shall we scruple occasionally to repeat the very words which we before used; because it would be the absurdest waste of time, to take trouble in finding some new expression for a thought which has been already put forth. Protestants consider that the general spirit of the Gospels is altogether adverse to the Roman Catholic view of the Blessed Virgin. We maintain in reply, that a conclusion of Euclid is hardly more rigorously demonstrable, than is the direct contradictory of this

* [See the preceding Essay in this volume.]

Protestant allegation. The one implication of the Gospel narrative, we most confidently maintain, is that her position is immeasurably exalted above—nay is essentially different in kind from—that of any other among her Son's redeemed.

II.

Before entering on the Gospels, we follow our author in pointing to prophecy. How was the very first announcement of future redemption put forth on that momentous occasion, when the penalties incurred by man were judically pronounced? As Dr. Northcote truly observes (p. 35), the question between "Ipse" and "Ipsa" is to our present purpose quite irrelevant. Let us accept, with Protestants, the former, which in truth is the more probable reading; and let us see the extraordinary significance of the manner in which this great Protevangel points to Mary. We entered on this in October;* and may thus sum up what we there drew out. Two parties are mentioned in the prophecy, between whom God will place irreconcilable "enmities." These are the respective parties of evil and good; those who fight under the respective banners of the devil and of God. The one party, receiving its name in the prophecy from Satan, includes all evil men. The other party, *receiving its name in the prophecy from Mary*, includes firstly *the In-*

* [See pp. 173–176 of this volume.]

carnate God; and secondly all good men. The prophecy points to Mary, as to the one predicted enemy of Satan; to Christ and good Christians as jointly constituting her seed; to Christ and good Christians as agreeing in this, that He and they are alike born of God and of Mary. It bears thinking of again and again, that God's first promise of a Redeemer was not made (so to speak) directly and categorically; but was embedded in His promise of a Co-Redemptress. No extent of doctrine and devotion concerning the Blessed Virgin, which good Catholics have ever imagined, can go beyond the obvious and unforced scope of this amazing prediction.

The same feature—though undoubtedly with much less prominence—is visible in subsequent prophecy.

"In all that the prophets announced, in all that the patriarchs and the principal figures of the old law foreshadowed, about the coming Messias, "the woman" had her place; they could not be separated, the woman and her seed, the Mother and the Son. At one time it is Isaias who prophesies (vii. 14), "Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son;" or again (xi. 1), "There shall come forth a rod out of the root of Jesse, and a flower shall rise up out of his root;" where the prophet's words immediately call to our minds that rod of Aaron, laid up in the tabernacle of the covenant, which in a miraculous manner, and not in obedience to the ordinary laws of cultivation, budded and bloomed blossoms or flowers, and bore fruit,* thereby presenting us with a lively image of the miraculous birth of Jesus from the virginal womb of Mary. She

* Numbers xvii. 8.

is the rod of Aaron, the rod out of the root of Jesse (the family of David), and Jesus is its flower; a flower springing up as the flowers of the field do, without the care and culture of man. At another time it is the prophet Micheas (who seems to stand in much the same relation to Isaias as the evangelist St. Mark does to St. Matthew, each being apparently the abbreviator of the writer who had preceded him), foretelling the future greatness of the little town of Bethlehem as the birthplace of our Lord; and here again (ver. 2) special mention is made of her that should bear Him. The prophet first speaks of His divine generation as the Son of God, saying, that "His going forth is from the beginning, from the days of eternity;" and then he mentions also His human generation, His birth, of the blessed Virgin, in time, "the time wherein she that travaileth shall bring forth." Elsewhere we find Jeremias (xxxi. 22) declaring that "the Lord hath created a new thing upon the earth, a woman shall compass a man." (pp. 36–8.)

And Dr. Northcote proceeds to enlarge with great force and beauty, on the various symbols and types, by which Mary was prefigured in the Old Testament. Then consider further (what, if not strictly prophecy, at least closely resembles it as being so impressive a symbolical representation), the view of our Blessed Lady given by S. John in the Apocalypse (xii. 1–6): "A woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet." What words can be more significant, as expressing a place at the very summit of creation? And in this vision again, as in the Protevangel, Satan contends directly against her, and but indirectly against her Son. Before entering then on the Gospels, we

are prepared to find therein truly marvellous things concerning this superexalted personage.

III.

The first fact in them, and one which strikes you at the very outset, is the circumstance of Christ having a human mother at all. This is far more remarkable than we are in the habit of thinking, because familiarity has blinded us to its extraordinary significance. There would have been no greater miracle than was in fact wrought—indeed it would have been far *less* miraculous—had He appeared at once on earth, e. g., as an infant, and had some pious woman been commissioned by God to foster Him in His earliest years. Let us suppose that the two facts became known to us successively. Firstly, we hear that God has become incarnate for our sake; and when we have had time to ponder duly on this, we learn the further fact that He has been borne for nine months in the womb of a Virgin Mother. Our immediate inference would assuredly be, that this Mother is associated with Him in His redeeming office by some most close and mysterious union. How forcibly is this stated by Dr. Northcote! And yet his words do not exceed by one tittle the simple lesson legitimately deducible from facts.

"Her maternity of Jesus was not a mere event in her life,—a quality that belonged to her,—*it was her whole history, and the very cause of her being.* She was created for this special purpose and no other.

She is the Mother of God, just as men are men, and angels are angels. This is the whole account of her being, the definition of her essence, so that *she stands alone, forming as it were a class by herself in the hierarchy of created beings, distinct from every other, and by this special relation above every other,* because brought so much nearer to God than any other" (p. 61).

But Jesus Christ was not content (if we may so speak) with being born of her—with deriving from her His Human Nature. As Dr. Northcote points out, He spent ten-elevenths of His earthly life—thirty years out of thirty-three—in most humble obedience to her.

"Stupendous thought! Wonderful fact! Has it no meaning? Had it no consequences? Is it possible that men who profess a most religious reverence for every word that fell from the lips of Jesus, can be altogether indifferent to a word, an act of His, *which lasted nearly all His life through?* that men who find in those questions—'How is it that you sought me!' 'Did you not know?'—convincing arguments in disparagement of her to whom they were addressed, can turn a deaf ear to the panegyric of thirty years' silent obedience to the same 'Blessed Woman?' Compare with this mode of handling God's word the comment which St. Bernard makes upon the history we have been considering. 'He is subject to them,' —Who is subject? and to whom? God to man. God, to Whom the Angels themselves are subject, Whom Principalities and Powers obey, God is subject to Mary, and not to Mary only, but to Joseph also for Mary's sake. Admire which you will, and say which is the more admirable of the two, the gracious condescension of the Son, or the excelling dignity of

the Mother. Both are stupendous, miraculous. God obeying a woman—humility without example. A woman commanding God—exaltation without parallel" (pp. 177–8).

Such is the extraordinary, the almost bewildering greatness of Mary's prerogative. During far the greater portion of God's human life upon earth, she exercised over Him the authority of a Mother. Then consider further what followed from this; her unspeakable familiarity of thought and communion with Him.

"Who shall say what mutual converse passed between the soul of the Son and the soul of the Mother during those years of retirement and solitude? Who shall count the profusion of lights and graces she received? or measure the height of sanctity to which a soul, so faithful in its correspondence to grace and so admirable in its purity and diligence, must needs have arrived after so long and intimate a converse with the very source and fountain of grace Himself?

"She, whose blessed privilege it was during so many years to unite the active and contemplative service of God in their very highest perfection; tending, nursing, and feeding Jesus as an infant, and ministering to all His temporal wants as he grew up, whilst at the same time she 'sat at His feet,' watching His every word and work, 'keeping and pondering them all in her heart'" (pp. 176–7).

But why, ask Protestants, has no record been preserved of their mutual converse during this period? Surely it is *Protestants* who will find difficulty in answering this question; for no Catholic could have anticipated such a record. If Mary were but an

ordinary Christian, our Lord's instructions to her must have been as suitable for preservation, as His instructions to the woman of Samaria, to S. Martha, to S. Mary Magdalene. But if she belonged to a sphere immeasurably higher,—to a sphere absolutely and entirely removed above the apprehension of ordinary men—the thought of recording for future ages her colloquies with Jesus would be simply wild and extravagant. As well might you think of unfolding to mortal men the mutual conversation of Angels in heaven.

During thirty years then, out of His thirty-three on earth, either Mary and Joseph together, or afterwards Mary alone, were His sole intimates; His sole disciples. Nor did He in the latter period practise towards any other human being what approached ever so distantly to the closeness and unreservedness of His earlier intercourse with Mary. The Apostles were taught by Him collectively and as it were formally; with none is He represented as cultivating in any degree that uninterrupted domestic intimacy, which characterised His relations with His mother and His foster-father.

Of course however, when His public ministry began, His familiarity with Mary was for a time greatly interrupted; and on this inevitable fact Protestants have most strangely built an objection. But a moment's consideration will show, that this circumstance tells directly and most forcibly in favour of Catholics; that on *Catholic* principles it was a necessity, whereas no *Protestant* can give any explanation of it whatever.

If, as Protestants suppose, Mary was on a level with ordinary Christians, no reason can be imagined why her name should not be united with that of Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Susanna, and other holy women, who went about "ministering to Him of their substance;" no reason in fact can be imagined why she should not have taken a position among His disciples. But if, as Catholics believe, she was at that time immeasurably more versed in heavenly mysteries than the Apostles became at the very end of their lives,—then what place could she have occupied in her Son's company? Not the place of learner; for no lesson could by possibility be given in common to her and to them. Was she to accompany Him then, as His co-teacher? To state such a supposition is to refute it. In a word, the Protestant hypothesis totally breaks down at the first attempt to confront it with facts; whereas, on the Catholic view, everything proceeds straightforwardly and intelligibly. He devoted His first thirty years to her instruction, and inclusively to Joseph's; His last three to the instruction of others. And He went forth to that work comparatively Alone, unsolaced by her company, to show that the disciples of Christ, and especially His priests, must be ready to forsake all domestic ties however holy, where His service is in question. (See Dr. Northcote, p. 216.)

His three years of Public Life were succeeded by His Day of Suffering. The two awful events, which began and ended this day, were respectively His Agony and His Crucifixion. The former was in its very

nature a solitary endurance of anguish unspeakable. The proximity of three sleeping Apostles was only an additional source of suffering; but the presence of one whose heart beat in fullest and most unwearying sympathy with His Own would have been out of harmony with the whole scene. At His Crucifixion on the other hand she was present, in the very foreground; she was present where she would most keenly taste that suffering which became her as Co-Redemptress, and could drink the bitter cup to its very dregs. She was there in company with the holy women; but not like them (Luke xxiii. 27) did she give way to wailing and lamentation.

"On the contrary, there is an entire absence of *every sign of natural weakness* and of woe; no fainting or sobbing, no outcry, no wild gesture of uncontrollable grief; she stands motionless as a statue, not surely a statue of indifference, nor yet of stupor and amazement, but simply a statue of tranquillity: a witness of all that happens, *a fellow-victim in some sort with the sufferer*, herself ready to do and to suffer God's Holy Will in all things, even at this most trying moment of her life. 'She *stood* by the Cross of her Son.' Amid that troubled scene of pain and sorrow, blood and tears; amid the blasphemies of the executioners, the insults of the people, the consternation of the disciples, the cries and lamentations of the pious women, the last words and the loud cry of the Divine Victim Himself, the commotion and darkness of entire nature, Mary, the Virgin Mother Mary, with a strength beyond her sex, beyond that of ordinary humanity, stood calm and silent." (Pp. 238–9.)

IV.

From His Death we proceed to His Resurrection. Catholics hold with absolute confidence, that Mary saw Him Risen, before any other human being enjoyed that privilege; and Protestants very naturally lay great stress on the total silence of Scripture concerning this circumstance. But even before we look into the matter with full care and attention, it is obvious on the very surface that this argument, if it proved anything, would prove too much. Had the inspired writers indeed mentioned an appearance to His Mother, but placed such appearance at a later date,—Catholics would be involved in some perplexity. But as the thing stands, if the silence of Scripture shows that He did not appear to her *first*, it equally shows that He did not appear to Her *at all*.* Now, considering that

* It may be said indeed, that S. Mark expressly denies the Catholic view, by saying (xvi. 9) "apparuit *primò* Mariæ Magdalenæ." But the context at once explains this. The word is not "primæ" "πρώτῃ"; but "πρῶτον"; and S. Mark at once adds that *she* announced it to "those who had been with Him." His obvious meaning then is, that our Blessed Lord (contrariwise perhaps to what might have been expected) appeared to S. Mary Magdalene before He appeared to the Apostles themselves; that through her they first heard of His Resurrection. We may thus paraphrase the sacred words: "Jesus, wishing to make known His Resurrection to the disciples, appeared first, with that end in view, to Mary Magdalene; and *she* told *them*." Moreover, if we look at S. John's detailed account of this interview with S. Mary Magdalene (xx. 1–17), we find that it took place some considerable time after His Resurrection. *Where had He been in the intermediate period?* See the remarks made presently in the text.

she was so prominently present at His Death, and considering that she was also with the Apostles during the ten days after His Ascension,—the most extreme Protestant will shrink from alleging that she never saw Him on earth after His burial; that she was permitted no such consolation for her exceeding grief. It is most certain therefore, most manifest, that the silence of Scripture gives here no strength whatever to a Protestant's position.

But if we study carefully the later chapters of the Gospel narrative, we shall be led perhaps to a conclusion, which bears importantly on the matter before us. Dr. Northcote holds an opinion, which F. Newman advocated in one of his Anglican sermons, and for which he cited (if we rightly remember) patristic authority. He considers (p. 275) that, before our Lord's Death, the Apostles' belief in His Divine Personality was but "implicit" and "virtual": or rather perhaps (as we should prefer to express the matter) that they speculatively accepted it, and were prepared (as in S. Peter's case, Matt. xvi. 16) expressly to affirm it; but did not, nevertheless, realize and practically apprehend it. After the Resurrection, all this was very different. And accordingly, if we look carefully at facts, we shall find that their demeanour to Him at this later period differed most strikingly from the familiarity of their approach—the readiness of their questioning and speech—before His Death. However this may be—and it is in no respect whatever essential to our argument—no fact is more certain, than that Jesus Risen did not habitually live

in their company as He had done before, but confined Himself to occasional visits. For instance, during the whole six days which elapsed between Easter and Low Sundays, He did not visit them at all. The Gospel narrative thus leaves a gap, which it is absolutely necessary to fill up one way or other. Where *did* our Lord permanently abide during the Great Forty Days? We are only aware of two answers, which have ever been given to this question. St. Bonaventure considers that He abode in the Limbus Patrum; but by far the commoner opinion has been, that He lived in the society of His Blessed Mother. We think that to every attentive reader of the Gospels this latter will appear far the more probable hypothesis.

Indeed let this once be supposed, and all difficulty in the inspired narrative forthwith disappears. His Risen Life on earth consisted of two different elements; His permanent abode with Mary, and His frequent visits to the Christian flock. Had the Gospels then spoken of His *appearing* to her, in the sense in which He appeared to S. Mary Magdalene or to S. Peter, they would have conveyed an impression directly false. Nor can any adverse inference whatever be drawn from the *silence* of Scripture, for this simple reason if for no other. It is absolutely certain that, during those Forty Days, He did not, as regarded His Human Nature, abide in heaven; and it is plain on the surface of Scripture that He did not abide with His disciples. If the silence of Scripture proved anything, it would prove that He abode *nowhere:* which, of course, is metaphysically impossible. And this circumstance,

by the way, is a strong additional proof, how utterly precarious are all arguments drawn from the mere silence of Scripture.

Entirely in harmony with the above statement is Dr. Northcote's comment on the appearances of Jesus Risen. He had been anticipated indeed in his remark by the Rev. J.B. Morris, in that writer's deeply learned work on "Jesus the Son of Mary." The visits of Jesus Risen—such is Mr. Morris's very quaint expression—were "professional" visits of the Heavenly "Physician"; they implied some morbid state in those who were their object. And so Dr. Northcote.

"Not a single person is recorded to have had any share in the appearances of our Risen Saviour, upon whom the sacred narrative has not set some mark of blame with reference to them; either for error or for ignorance, for weakness of faith or for positive incredulity; and it would seem that the sight of Jesus, which was vouchsafed to them, was intended as a distinct remedy for the evils under which they laboured" (p. 258).

In no part of her life then was the vast distinction between Mary and Christ's other redeemed more conspicuously manifested, than in her secluded life with her Son during those unspeakably happy days: those days when Redemption had been accomplished; when His suffering was for ever at an end; and when for the very first time His presence was a cause to her of unmixed joy.

There can be no doubt, from Acts i. 14, that on the Day of Pentecost Mary was in the midst of that

assemblage which received the Holy Ghost. It has been asked however by Protestants, why it is that the Scripture account of her here ends; that during the rest of her life she is not recorded as appearing on the public ecclesiastical scene; that "the Queen of the Apostles" is passed over so silently in the Apostolic epistles. All this is beside Dr. Northcote's purpose, who writes on "Mary in the *Gospels*"; but we may refer to our own remarks on the matter last October.* If her office and position were really what Catholics suppose, the profound silence of Scripture is most easily understood; but we have never been able to imagine what explanation *Protestants* can give of this silence. We must not however here omit one very striking remark of our author, on the place occupied by the Deipara among the witnesses to her Son.

"The foundation of the whole Christian religion, or rather its very essence, its sum and substance, is the doctrine of the Incarnation: the doctrine, that is, that Jesus Christ was no mere man, or the son of a man; but that in His one Divine Person were united the two natures, of man and of God; that He was 'made indeed of a woman,' born of the Virgin Mary, but that He had no man for His father, having been conceived by the Holy Ghost. This is the whole of Christianity; all other doctrines flow from it as their source, or cluster round it as their centre. And who was there, my brethren, that could bear testimony to this foundation, this essential corner-stone, or (as I have more truly called it) this summary of the Christian Faith, without which the whole system would have no meaning or value? Clearly *there was no human testimony possible,*

* [See the preceding Essay in this volume, pp. 186–191.]

save of one only person, her in whom the mystery itself was accomplished. She alone could throw a flood of light upon that secret work of God. If in other matters the Apostles were to be witnesses to the world, in this *Mary must have been a witness, and the only witness, to them;* an Evangelist to the Evangelists; an Apostle of the Apostles, as some of the Doctors of the Church have called her; or, as we sing daily in the Litany, Queen of the Apostles, their mistress, mother, and teacher." (Pp. 274–5.)

Lastly it is often treated as an objection to Catholics, that Christians are left by Scripture in such ignorance on the details of that portion of her life, which passed before the Incarnation. On this also we spoke in October.*

V.

Here, then, we close our general view of Mary's life on earth. It may be divided into six portions:—(1) the period preceding the Annunciation; (2) the years which elapsed from this to the beginning of our Lord's public ministry; (3) the time of that ministry itself; (4) the hours which passed from the beginning of His Passion to His Resurrection; (5) the Great Forty Days; (6) her life on earth after His Ascension. As to each one of these portions, Scripture—whether by its language or its silence—assigns her that very position, which harmonizes more than any other with the Catholic doctrine.

* [See the preceding Essay in this volume, pp. 182–185.]

Protestants, on the other hand, are nowhere: they are utterly unable to give any colourable account whatever, no matter how superficial, of the Scripture record concerning her, so far as regards its general features. Nay, they make no attempt to do so, for all their vague and random talking about the silence of Scripture. They indulge in special pleading on one or two isolated texts, but do not even profess to grapple with the Gospel narrative as a whole. The isolated facts which they cite are in number just four. Even if the Catholic had some difficulty in explaining these,—surely four isolated facts are of very little weight, in comparison with that comprehensive view of the entire Gospel narrative which the Catholic exhibits. But in truth the four facts which they do quote cannot be made available to their purpose, without the most monstrous (however unintentional) perversion. And we will now proceed in detail, with Dr. Northcote's assistance, to prove this statement.

1. Luke ii. 49.—"Quid est quòd Me quærebatis? Nesciebatis quia in his quæ Patris Mei sunt oportet Me esse?" Protestants treat these words as a *rebuke* to His Mother. A rebuke for what? No other answer can be imagined, except for inopportunely seeking Him, when He was to begin His public ministry. "How is it you were so thoughtless as to seek Me, "when you ought to have known better? when you "ought to have known that the time was come, for My "leaving Nazareth, and engaging in My Father's "work?" That any one can have gravely advocated

such an interpretation as this, reads one an instructive lesson on the blindness of party spirit. In itself the interpretation is startling enough. The course then, it appears, which Mary and Joseph ought to have taken on discovering His absence, was to return home without trouble or inquiry!! But when taken in connection with the facts recorded by S. Luke, this interpretation is seen to be simply marvellous. In the first place, He was not beginning His public ministry at all: He was not teaching, but "hearing, and asking questions." Secondly, as to the time having come for Him to leave Nazareth;—on the contrary, not even one-half of His appointed time for sojourning there had yet elapsed. Mary and Joseph were rebuked, forsooth, for wishing to take Him home with them. And *how* were they rebuked for this? By His straightway *going* home with them, and continuing His life of subjection to their authority.

Since therefore the words cannot possibly mean anything which will benefit the Protestant cause, it is controversially quite unimportant to ascertain their positive sense. We would submit however with diffidence our explanation of the whole event. By His thirty years' subjection to His "parents," our Blessed Lord inculcated forcibly the ordinary rule of obedience to parents: by remaining behind at Jerusalem, He illustrated the necessary exception—the obligation of neglecting filial ties, where God summons to His service. He could not have emphatically inculcated this, had He acquainted Mary and Joseph with His intention: because they would of course have at once

humbly acquiesced; whereas the whole lesson was to turn on His acting without their consent. "But He inflicted thereby cruel pain on His Mother." Well, that is for Protestants to explain no less than Catholics; for, however disparaging their thoughts of her, they will not believe that her Son inflicted pain on her without sufficient reason. Catholics however reply very easily, that His Mother's sufferings were involved in her office of Co-Redemptress. It was included in that bond of anguish which united Jesus and Mary, that He was ever inflicting cruel pain on her, and intensifying His own grief by the infliction. And now for the words themselves on which Protestants insist. Surely they carry with them an obvious interpretation. "How is it that ye sought Me"—He tenderly asks them—"among your kinsfolk and acquaintances?" (v. 44). "Did you think that I would leave you for *them?* There was but One for Whom I would leave you, and it was in His House that you should at once have looked for Me." Not even His Mother fully understood at the time His meaning in the brief words He used. He adopted in fact a form of instruction, which perhaps (if we may dare to conjecture) was not unusual with Him in addressing her; viz., using words which were more or less above her immediate apprehension, in order that she might the rather (verse 51) ponder His deep sayings in her heart, and grow by degrees to their fuller understanding.

2. John ii. 4.—"Quid Mihi et tibi, mulier? Nondum venit Hora Mea." Here, again, let us first consider the Protestant interpretation of this text. His

Mother, it seems, makes a request so unbecoming—so irreconcilable with the due order of His Providence—so unsuitable to the relation in which she really stood to Him—as to draw down on her a deserved rebuke. Yet our Lord proceeds to *grant* this unbecoming, unseasonable, unsuitable request, even though He rebukes her for making it. Could any one have imagined beforehand, that believers in Christianity would make so wild a supposition?

Here then, as in the last case, it is abundantly certain that Protestants are totally astray, when they seek in this verse any kind of sanction for their misbelief. The fact of our Lord *working* the miracle which she solicited, will always be an insuperable barrier against the notion that she was *rebuked* for such solicitation. Protestants therefore can obtain no advantage from our conceding—which we do concede—that the text is a very difficult one, and that we cannot suggest any interpretation which is in every respect satisfactory. There are several very difficult texts in Scripture, intended doubtless to exercise the pious investigation of believers; and this is one of the number. To Mary our Lord's saying was evidently altogether intelligible: but then she had now lived during thirty years for the one end of contemplating and loving Him; she understood well every proverbial expression which fell from His lips; nay, every inflection of His voice and every aspect of His countenance. Words, then, which as they stand inactive on paper are most mysterious,—when spoken by that well-known voice, and illustrated by gesture, at once carried with them their true sense. What

that sense was, there is no call for us to consider; because, as we have already shown, it cannot possibly be one which will ever so distantly sanction the amazing Protestant notion, that the address was in some degree an address of rebuke and disapproval.*

3. Matt. xii. 46–50; Mark iii. 31–35; Luke viii. 19–21. The incident of His Mother and brethren seeking Him, and of His reply. Dr. Northcote has been particularly successful, we think, in his treatment of this incident (pp. 201-218). We certainly cannot say in this, as in the two former instances, that the Protestant interpretation is monstrous and preposterous; but we do say that, even if these texts were considered exclusively by their own light, the Protestant interpretation is far less truth-resembling than either of the two suggested by Dr. Northcote. If Protestants are to derive any controversial advantage from Christ's reply, it must be by assuming that His Mother interrupted Him unseasonably, and that He publicly expressed His sense of such unseasonableness. But now put the very case with which Protestants often love to compare the circumstance: put the case, that a pious and zealous human preacher is unseasonably interrupted by his mother for some frivolous reason. Undoubtedly he would continue his

* [In my original article I discussed this question for a page or two. I am now however quite dissatisfied with the interpretation which I there suggested. Were the case otherwise, I should not now reprint those pages; because I can refer to F. Coleridge's treatment of the matter, in the first volume of his great work on the Gospels.]

ministration notwithstanding her importunity; but would he express *blame* of her to his hearers? Is *this* the example of filial conduct, which Protestants consider to have been given by God Incarnate? Nor is there the slightest necessity for such a supposition, since Christ's words do not contain one single expression which indicates blame. This would be entirely true, even though it were supposed that He did not immediately go to His Mother, but continued His instruction to the people. Dr. Northcote however has shown, we think, that the view is decidedly more probable which he himself prefers (p. 214). We consider then that Our Blessed Lady had some excellent reason for wishing to see Him (see Dr. Northcote, p. 212), and that He hastened to comply with her request. He proceeded first however, in conformity with His very frequent custom, to set forth a spiritual lesson founded on the passing occurrence. "He looked round on those that sat about Him" (Mark iii. 34), and spoke to them in effect as follows: "You see how tenderly I love My Mother and My brethren. Yet at last who are My Mother and My brethren as distinct from others? You who are present (rightly) love your mothers and your brethren far more dearly than you love many others, whom you know to be greatly their superiors in piety. But with Me it is not so. My Mother and My brethren are dear to Me, precisely in proportion to the degree of their love for God. Accordingly, whoever of *you* shall faithfully fulfil My Father's Law, that person too shall be to Me as mother or brother."

4. Luke xi. 27–8.—"Beatus venter qui Te portavit et ubera quæ suxisti." "Quinimmò beati qui audiunt verbum Dei et custodiunt illud." "Blessedness in its highest sense," here says the Divine Teacher, "consists, not in being My Mother, but in fulfilling God's commandments." Who are so forward in enforcing this lesson as Catholics? What else is taught in the exercises of S. Ignatius, nay, in the very second answer of a poor child's catechism? All men are more excellent, more admirable, more perfect of their kind, precisely in proportion as they love God more earnestly and obey Him more effectively. "If it were possible," says our author (p. 227), "for a man to surpass the sanctity of Mary, he would" be more blessed than is even she. True, the *foundation* of her highest blessedness was the blessedness of her Divine Maternity: it was *in consequence of* her Maternity that He gave her that singular grace, which exalts her sanctity so immeasurably above that of all other creatures. Her sanctity was given her, we say, *because* of her Maternity; but nevertheless it is a higher blessedness even than that.

The occasion was most suitable for inculcating this lesson. The woman, indeed—and this should be carefully observed—was directly and primarily expressing her admiration of Jesus; and but indirectly and secondarily of His Mother, whom she did not know. "Happy must be the mother," she said, "of such a Son!" If this passage contained a reproof of her for admiring Mary, it would contain a far *more* pointed reproof of her for admiring Jesus. But in fact, as a

moment's consideration will show, it is not admiration which is here reproved, but *barren* admiration. Evidently this woman, instead of entering into herself and pondering on our Lord's practical lessons, thought of nothing but His external grace and persuasiveness. It was very important therefore to remind her, that even His Mother's blessedness consisted chiefly in her sanctity.

"The praise of our Blessed Lady's privilege as the Mother of God in the mouth of this poor woman was all very well: but it was calculated to turn men's minds away from any practical imitation of our Lady's virtues; since *as* a privilege, it was wholly personal and incommunicable to any other. But the case was far otherwise with her sanctity; *this could be imitated, and this is what our Blessed Lord desired*" (pp. 226, 7).

Protestants then can make no controversial capital whatever out of this text, unless they put forth two somewhat startling propositions. They must maintain firstly, that Mary was *not* one of those who "hear the word of God and keep it;" and they must maintain secondly, that the personal admiration of Jesus Himself is a matter for deserved reproof.

In regard, then, to these four passages on which the Protestant lays so much stress, we maintain most confidently—not that their weight is overbalanced by others in a contrary direction, and by the general drift of Scripture—but that they have no weight whatever; nay, as regards three out of the four, that their Protestant interpretation is simply monstrous and intolerable.

VI.

Our limits warn us to draw towards an end. Yet we are unwilling to pass over one particular incident, which throws especial light on Mary's great dignity; we mean her visit to S. Elizabeth. There are two particulars in this visit, to which we would separately refer. We have already seen that Christ's first *public* miracle was wrought in reply to His Mother's intercession; but we here observe also, that His first *miracle* was wrought through her *instrumentality*. Dr. Northcote points out (pp. 114–116) how undeniable it is, that He miraculously sanctified His Precursor, before that Precursor's birth. But further, as our author also shows, the moment chosen by Him for working that miracle was when the voice of Mary's salutation sounded in Elizabeth's ears. "And do not say that this was then unavoidable, because Jesus was in Mary's womb, and could not be separated from her. For He might have performed this miracle in silence and at a distance;" but on the contrary, "He chose to use a human instrument, and that instrument was Mary" (p. 332).

But now, secondly, who was Elizabeth? The wife of a priest, who had been lately favoured with an angelic visit; bearing within her a child of promise and of prophecy, than whom no greater had arisen among the sons of women. (See Dr. Northcote, p. 117.) Great was she then undoubtedly in office

and in dignity; yet she seemed penetrated with a sense of Mary's singular condescension in coming to visit her. "Whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me?" as though the latter held a position in the Christian dispensation, elevated above her own—not in *degree* merely, but in *kind*. As Dr. Northcote observes, it reminds one of her son's speech to his Redeemer: "I have need to be baptized of Thee, and *comest Thou to me?*" And this expression of some most signal honour conveyed by Mary's visit is the more remarkable, because God Incarnate was also present; and yet Elizabeth speaks explicitly, not of His visit, but of His Mother's.

We wish we had space to linger for a much longer period over Dr. Northcote's fascinating theme. And we have to thank him most heartily, not only for having drawn the attention of English Catholics to so important and interesting a subject, but also for having treated that subject so worthily; with so much learning and thoughtfulness; with so much piety and unction.

THE SACRED HEART.

The Divine Glory of the Sacred Heart. By Henry Edward, Archbishop of Westminster. London: Burns & Oates.

Dr. Nicholson's Accusation of the Archbishop of Westminster. By Catholicus. London: Burns & Oates.

[January, 1874.]

I.

THERE is hardly any fact of our time which to us seems so hopeful and cheering, as the recent fresh burst of devotion to the Sacred Heart, which has shown itself in this as in other European countries. A new era has opened in ecclesiastical history; and Catholics are about to be confronted with perils, both in the intellectual and the political order, such as the Church has perhaps never before had to encounter. And what will be the Catholic's securest defence in such a crisis? Love and loyalty to the Person of Jesus Christ. This has ever been the Church's centre of life and strength, as F. Newman for one has often profoundly and eloquently set forth; nor can we strike a better key-note to our present article, than by placing before our readers some of his noble language on this theme. How did Christianity first conquer the world? By the preaching of Christ.

"A Deliverer of the human race through the

Jewish nation had been promised from time immemorial. The day came when He was to appear, and He was eagerly expected; moreover, One actually did make his appearance at that date in Palestine, and claimed to be He. He left the earth without apparently doing much for the object of His coming. But when He was gone, His disciples took upon themselves to go forth to preach to all parts of the earth with the object of preaching *Him*, and collecting converts *in His name*. After a little while they are found wonderfully to have succeeded. Large bodies of men in various places are to be seen, professing to be His disciples, owning Him as their King, and continually swelling in number and penetrating into the populations of the Roman Empire; at length they convert the Empire itself. All this is historical fact. Now, we want to know the farther historical fact, viz., the cause of their conversion. In other words, what were the topics of that preaching which was so effective? If we believe what is told us by the preachers and their converts, the answer is plain. They 'preached Christ;' they called on men to believe, hope, and place their affections in that Deliverer, who had come and gone; and the moral instrument by which they persuaded them to do so, was a description of the life, character, mission and power of that Deliverer, a promise of His invisible Presence and Protection here, and of the Vision and Fruition of Him hereafter. From first to last to Christians, as to Abraham, He himself is the centre and fulness of the dispensation. They, as Abraham, 'see His day, and are glad.'

"A temporal sovereign makes himself felt by means of his subordinate administrators, who bring his power and will to bear upon every individual of his subjects. The universal Deliverer, long expected, when He came, instead of wielding a temporal sway,

nay, instead of making and securing subjects by a visible graciousness or majesty, departs; — *but* is found, through His preachers, to have imprinted the Image or Idea of Himself in the minds of His subjects individually; and that Image, cherished and worshipped in individual minds, becomes a principle of association, and a real bond of those subjects one with another, who are thus united to the body by being united to that Image; and moreover that Image, which is their moral life when they are actually converted, is also the original instrument of their conversion. It is the Image of Him who fulfils the one great need of human nature, the Healer of its wounds, the Physician of the soul, this Image it is which both creates faith, and then rewards it.

"When we recognize this central Image as the vivifying idea both of the Christian body and of individuals in it, then, certainly, we are able to take into account two, at least, of Gibbon's causes, as having, in connection with that idea, some influence, both in making converts and in strengthening them to persevere. It was the Thought of Christ, not a corporate body or a doctrine, which inspired that zeal which the historian so poorly comprehends. . . . .

"Now all this, perhaps, will be called cloudy, mystical, unintelligible; that is, in other words, miraculous. I think it is so. How, without the Hand of God, could a new idea, one and the same, enter at once into myriads of men, women, and children of all ranks, especially the lower, and have power to wean them from their indulgences and sins, and to nerve them against the most cruel tortures, and to last in vigour as a sustaining influence for seven or eight generations, till it founded an extended polity, broke the obstinacy of the strongest and wisest government which the world has ever seen, and forced its way from its first caves and catacombs to the fulness

of imperial power?" ("Grammar of Assent," pp. 457–9.)

And what was the strength of Christanity at its outset, continues to be its strength now.

"As human nature itself is still in life and action as much as ever it was, so He too lives, to our imaginations, by His visible symbols, as if He were on earth, with a practical efficacy which even unbelievers cannot deny to be the corrective of that nature, and its strength day by day. And this power of perpetuating His Image, being altogether singular and special and the prerogative of Him and Him alone, is a grand evidence how well He fulfils to this day that Sovereign Mission which, from the first beginning of the world's history, has been in prophecy assigned to Him" (ib. p. 482).

And conversely, to overthrow this Image of Jesus Christ, is in effect to overthrow Christianity from its foundation. Hear the Archbishop's words, in the admirable Sermon which we have named at the head of our article:—

"S. John, in his first Epistle, writes thus: 'Every spirit that dissolveth Jesus is not of God, and this is Antichrist of whom you have heard that he cometh, and he is already in the world.' The meaning of the words 'who dissolveth Jesus' is this;—whosoever denies that the Son of God is come in the flesh, that is, the truth of His Incarnation, or in any way destroys the distinction of His two natures, or the unity of His Divine Person, or denies that He is the Incarnate God, or refuses to Him divine worship and the honour which is due to God alone—whosoever in these, or in any other way, destroys or denies the truth of the

Incarnation, 'dissolveth Jesus,' and whether he know it or not, is a disciple of Antichrist.

"The Person of our Divine Lord has been from the beginning the centre of all the chief heresies that have tormented the Christian world. Like as in warfare the hottest conflict is always around the person of the king, so, in the whole history of the Christian Church, the keenest assaults of heresy and the most concentrated enmity of heretics have been directed against the Incarnation of the Son of God."

But if loyalty and love to Jesus Christ be the Catholic's one strong and sure weapon, whether of offence or defence,—there is no devotion which will more effectively secure to him the true possession of that weapon, than devotion to the Sacred Heart. There is no devotion which appeals with greater depth and tenderness to "the little ones of Christ;" whether they be "poor in this world" while "rich in faith," or whether they be endowed with all intellectual gifts and attainments. And while on the one hand this devotion thus appeals to the heart, it no less certainly leads men to sound doctrine. The more we reflect on the matter, the more profoundly true we shall find the Archbishop's remark, that "as the doctrine of the Incarnation is the true test of the disciples of Jesus Christ, so the divine glory of the Sacred Heart is the true test of the doctrine of the Incarnation." Let any Catholic accept humbly those practical lessons on the Sacred Heart which the Church places before him,—he will be led securely to the full dogma on Jesus Christ, as defined by the Church against Arians, Nestorians, and Eutychians. And on the other hand

let any one be unconsciously unsound on the Incarnation, he will inevitably stumble at the Catholic devotion to the Sacred Heart. We have given two reasons then, why this devotion is so singularly precious in the Catholic's estimation. It secures that that central and vital Catholic Image—the Image of God Incarnate—shall at once be theologically faithful to its Original (and where it is *not* faithful there is no real Christianity), and shall also appeal with far greater sweetness, shall come home with far more intimate persuasiveness, to the heart and affections.

There is a third remark also concerning it, which is by no means to be lightly esteemed. It was F. Faber's opinion—and we heartily concur in it—that Saints' lives stand quite on a ground by themselves, and above every other kind of spiritual reading. There is no other spiritual reading, he thought, which, in the way of supernaturalizing the mind and imbuing it with the full Catholic spirit, can be even compared with those Saints' lives, which are written on what we have more than once called the "hagiological" method. By this term we mean to express a method which, avoiding all secular purpose and literary adornment, commemorates, so far as that can be made possible, *exclusively* (1) the Saint's communion with God; and (2) those external acts of his, which prominently exhibit the results of such communion. Now, the Life of B. Mary Margaret Alacoque refuses (as one may say) to be written in any other method; it *has* no secular or historical aspect. And it has been no small benefit resulting from devotion to the Sacred Heart,

that so very large a number of Catholics are led to study her life and revelations, her prayers, mortifications and terrible probations, who might otherwise be comparatively strangers to this style of reading. With very many this may be the auspicious beginning of a higher spiritual life.*

And the same kind of service which is done by this devotion towards the spiritual advancement of Catholics, is done by it also towards the conversion of externs. As F. Newman pointed out in the passage we quoted at starting, the Image of Christ has been the means of converting those without, no less than of attracting those within: nor (speaking generally) will any other exhibition of Catholic piety be so persuasive as this, with those "homines bonæ voluntatis," who as yet have failed to recognize the true mother of their souls.

* [On other occasions, more than one contributor to the "Dublin Review" has set forth the vast benefits of various kinds accruing from those numerous Saints' lives, which have been written on what may be called the *historical* method. As one out of many instances—in April, 1878, when dealing with the subject of Catholic college education, I made this remark: "It will be a training no less valuable in the moral than in the intellectual order, if the lives of Saints be placed before the students in their full historical bearing and relation to contemporary events." "As an illustration of our meaning," I presently added, "we may mention F. Newman's papers on S. Philip Neri in the 'Occasional' volume; or (on a much larger scale) F. Coleridge's admirable life of S. Francis Xavier" (p. 354). What is said in the text, then, refers exclusively to the value of Saints' lives, as regards the one particular purpose of *spiritual reading*.]

II.

Whence has it come, that quite of late there has been throughout Europe this fresh and intense outburst of devotion to the Sacred Heart, which we now witness? Perhaps the Holy Ghost has infused it into faithful souls, without using any human means as His occasion and instrument. The Archbishop at least says he "knows not whence it comes."* But here in England there are two visible events, which have been manifestly used by God for the purpose. The first of these is the ever-memorable Pilgrimage to Paray-le-Monial, on which we published an article in our last number, and of which we may truly say that it has left behind it ineffaceable results. The Catholics of England (thank God!) are peculiarly ready to seize every occasion of joining in heart and spirit with their coreligionists of other lands, and of breaking down whatever national barriers may be seen still to remain: and they joyously availed themselves of the opportunity, for uniting themselves heart and soul with the great religious movement of their day. Many were the seeds then sown in secret, which hereafter will germinate into visible and precious fruit.

But there is a second event of a very different kind,

* "I believe that this restoration of the light of the Sacred Heart, come from whence it may,—and I know not whence it came,—has been ordered to revive with an intense fervour and with a sevenfold ardour our devotion to the Person, the Name, the Passion of our Divine Redeemer" (p. 31).

which has had its place in pressing on the attention of Englishmen, not the devotion only, but still more its doctrinal basis; viz. the circumstance which is both cause and theme of our present article. It so happened that the Archbishop of Westminster—among whose many great services to the Church not the least has been his persevering encouragement of this devotion—in preaching on the Pilgrimage, had used a phrase which caused some commotion among Anglicans. He had said that "the Sacred Heart of our Lord, being united with the Divinity, is deified, and is therefore an Object of divine worship." This word "deified" (as we shall presently point out) is a word frequently used, both by the Fathers and by later theologians, to express the Catholic doctrine. At the same time, some might have doubted the expediency of using the word before a mixed audience, because in popular English its sense is different. But the result has shown, that the course actually taken by the Archbishop was the wiser. No one is more uniformly careful than his Grace, to speak with fullest forbearance, charity, affection, of those without: but nevertheless he uniformly refuses to hold back any particle, we do not only say of Catholic doctrine, but even (where occasion presents itself) of Catholic terminology. And he has signally promoted the interests of truth, by so acting on the present occasion. For this word "deify" took so violent a hold on the nerves of an Anglican clergyman, Dr. Nicholson, who happened to be present, that he would not be satisfied without bringing the matter before what is called "the tribunal

of public opinion." And thus it has happened, that the Catholic doctrine and devotion on the Sacred Heart, and also the vital dogmata with which these are so intimately connected, have not only been brought home with greatly increased vividness to the mind of Catholics, but have been pressed on the notice of hundreds of educated Protestants, whose thoughts might never otherwise have been turned to the subject.

Dr. Nicholson began his campaign, by writing to the Archbishop. The latter however referred the matter to one of his secretaries, Rev. Mr. Guiron; and various letters passed between the latter and Dr. Nicholson. Nothing could be better than the doctrine, the tone, and the temper of Mr. Guiron's letters; and if he failed to understand his opponent's meaning, this will most certainly surprise no one who has read Dr. Nicholson's letters. Pleased however with his own share in the matter, Dr. Nicholson sent the whole correspondence when completed to the "Guardian"; which published it in extenso, adding comments of its own. A series of five articles thereupon appeared in the "Tablet"; which have since been collected by their writer, who signs himself "Catholicus," into the pamphlet named by us at the head of our article.*

* [Cardinal Manning has since avowed his authorship of these most able papers. I suspected his authorship at the time from internal evidence, but was not aware of it as a fact. On the Cardinal's avowal of them in 1877, Dr. Nicholson published a reply. To my mind, this reply did not amend his position in the slightest degree. Still it has led me to omit various sentences of my article, which implied that the controversy had come to an end with the pamphlet of Catholicus.]

These were succeeded by the Archbishop's Sermon, also there named; which does not of course mention the controversy, but which throughout contains a tacit reference thereto. This Sermon will be pronounced by every one to be among the writer's most vigorous and successful compositions. It is one great benefit to the Church (as we have said) that the theme on which this discussion turns has been brought home so vividly to Catholics, and forced so urgently on the attention of Protestants. And it is a second great benefit, that the writings on both sides are such, that the dictate of theological reason is made most manifest, as telling against the Protestant and in favour of the Catholic controversialist.

III.

Before going further, we must say a few words on the doctrine concerned: viz. the adoration due to our Blessed Lord's Sacred Humanity in general, and His Sacred Heart in particular. In this we will not for the moment appeal to ecclesiastical and patristic authority: we will but consider the inference legitimately deducible, from that fundamental dogma which all the parties involved profess to accept. All the parties involved profess to hold, that Jesus Christ is God the Son, clothed in human nature, possessed of a human body and soul. The question controverted between them is on the adoration due to that Sacred Humanity and to its constituent parts.

Let us begin by betaking ourselves to the thought of her, who is given to the Church as the pattern and exemplar of piety towards Jesus: we mean of course His Most Holy Mother. Let us unite ourselves with her in spirit, as she kneels before her Infant lying in His cradle, while she knows, with immeasurably greater clearness and fulness than any Christian has since known, the revealed dogma concerning His Person and Nature. She adores Him as God:* this we assume as our foundation, which will be denied by neither of our antagonists. But what is implied in this? It is implied, we maintain, that she adores the Sacred Humanity *directly*,† as being the Humanity of God the Son. She adores directly God the Son: and she also adores directly the Sacred Humanity; the Sacred Body which she sees before her, and the Sacred Soul which animates that Body. This will be made manifest, if we consider the various alternatives which can be suggested by any one who rejects our statement.

Will it be said e. g. that when she is adoring her Infant Son, she is only adoring God the Son in His Divine Nature? No one will maintain this. On such a supposition she would not be directing her adoration in any sense to the Infant Jesus.

There is but one other way (as far as we see) which can be suggested, of holding what our opponents maintain; of holding that she adores indeed Jesus

* To avoid unnecessary repetition, throughout this article we will use the word "adore" to express the adoration of *latria*.

† "Illud substantialiter unitum est Objectum, *directum* quidem sed partiale, &c. &c."—Franzelin de Deo Incarnato, p. 457.

directly, but does *not* adore His Sacred Humanity directly. At one moment I adore God as being Merciful; at another time as being Just; at another time as being Faithful to His promises. In either case I expressly think of one only among His Attributes; I adore Him *in respect of his being* Merciful, or Just, or Faithful to His promises: though of course I implicitly bear in mind, that He is infinite in *all* excellences. In like manner—so it may be suggested—when Mary adores the Infant Jesus, she adores God the Son *in respect of His being* clothed in human nature; she *expressly thinks of Him* only in that one particular; and the presence before her of the Sacred Humanity makes that thought indefinitely more vivid. But this suggestion will not bear a moment's investigation. If such were the case, she would be adoring God the Son *in respect of His being* Jesus, but she would *not* be adoring Jesus as God the Son: and neither of our opponents (as we before observed) would venture to concur in such denial. But let us dwell on this suggestion a little more at length. Let us suppose e. g. that she leaves the apartment in which the Infant lies. In that case—according to the hypothesis before us—she would not in any sense be leaving the visible presence of the Object of her adoration,* but would only for the moment be less vividly reminded of His Incarnation. To say this, as we observed just now, is in fact to deny that she adores the Infant Jesus when she is in His visible presence.

* For on this hypothesis the Object of her adoration has never *been* visibly present.

The Infant whom she adores—God clothed in human nature—is here and not there; in this apartment and not in that: and to leave the apartment where He lies, is to leave the visible presence of the Object of her adoration.

We are brought then inevitably to the Catholic doctrine, that she adores directly the Body which she sees lying before her, and the Soul which she knows to animate that Body. She offers to them however that special adoration which is due to God, not for their own sake, as e. g. for the singular gifts with which that Soul is endowed—but absolutely and entirely for a different reason. She offers them that adoration, precisely because they are the Body and Soul of God the Son. She addresses her adoration directly to the Sacred Humanity, but she also addresses her adoration directly at the same moment to God the Son.

We now proceed a little further. As she kneels before Him, her rapturous contemplations assume a thousand different shapes. Perhaps at one moment she thinks expressly—not of the Sacred Humanity in general, but of the Holy Countenance in particular. She gazes, with unspeakable awe and yet unspeakable love, on His Face; and tries to discover therein indications of His Attributes, Whose Face she knows it to be. She offers to the Sacred Face however this special homage of latria—not at all *for the reason* of it so vividly setting forth the Divine attributes—but precisely and exclusively as being the Face of God the Son. If she adores the Sacred Humanity generally,

she may equally adore the Sacred Face in particular. It would be unmeaning and trifling with a serious subject, to attempt any such distinction, between the Sacred Humanity in general and its respective constituent parts.

At another time perhaps her thoughts wander to His Heart. The heart is the recognised symbol of human love; and the Heart of Jesus therefore symbolizes the love felt for mankind by the God-Man. If she thinks of that Heart, of course she adores It. She adores It however—not at all because It is the symbol of Jesus's love—but precisely and exclusively because it is the Heart of God the Son. The reason why she specially *thinks* of the Heart—rather e. g. than the Hands or the Feet—is because the Heart (and not the Hands or the Feet) symbolizes love. But whether she adore Heart, or Hands, or Feet, she *adores* them for no other reason, than that they are the Heart, the Hands, the Feet of Almighty God. Nay doubtless very often she does specially adore the Hands and the Feet; vividly remembering that these are the very Hands and Feet, which shall be pierced for the redemption of the world.

We have said enough (we hope) to exhibit the theology of that devotion, which our Blessed Lord, in His colloquies with B. Margaret Mary, pressed on the faithful. That they should worship his Sacred Heart in particular, singling it out for more prominent adoration from the various portions of his Sacred Humanity,—this has been in these last centuries earnestly commended to Catholics; because the thought of His

Heart speaks with such singular tenderness to *their* heart, and comes home to them with such singular vividness and persuasiveness. But it is involved in the Church's teaching from the first, that if the Sacred Heart be singled out for special worship *at all*, it must be worshipped with the adoration of latria.

Such then as we have now set forth is the doctrine, which has been scientifically expressed and defined by Popes, Councils, theologians: in earlier times as regards the Sacred Humanity in general, in later times as regards the Sacred Heart in particular. On the former subject we would refer to "Catholicus's" third chapter, as containing a perfect storehouse of patristic and scholastic dicta on the matter. Two samples here may suffice, considering how readily accessible is the pamphlet itself. S. Athanasius shall come first: "Neither do we adore His Body," says that Father, "*divided and apart* from the Word": implying of course, that the Catholics of his time did adore It, as being what he had just called "the Body of God" (p. 31). In like manner S. Thomas lays down expressly, that "the Humanity of Christ is to be adored with latria" (p. 35). On those *later* definitions which concern the Sacred Heart, we need say nothing; because every Anglican will readily admit, that they express the doctrine above set forth. See especially Pius VI.'s "Auctorem Fidei," propos. 61, 62, 63.

The particular controversy however with which we are directly engaged, necessitates our laying stress on one particular theological expression. The term "deification" has been used from the first—as in

other senses—so inclusively to express that august fact, "the assumption of manhood into God"; "the making of humanity to be God's Humanity." ("Catholicus," pp. 39, 40.) The whole of "Catholicus's" fourth chapter is occupied with collecting a few pregnant examples of this constant usage. And as he presents of course but a small specimen of those which might have been given, so we in turn can present but a small part of those which he gives. The Sixth Ecumenical Council declares (p. 47) that "His most holy spotless animate Flesh was not destroyed, by being *deified*"; and that so also "His Human Will, being *deified*, was not destroyed." S. Gregory of Nyssa: "that which *deifies* and that which is *deified* is one God" (p. 41). S. John Damascene commemorates "the deification of the Humanity" (ib.). S. Athanasius: "He *deified* that which He put on" (p. 42). S. Thomas: "the Human Nature is not called essentially God, but *deified*" (p. 44). Without recounting then the many other quotations which "Catholicus" has accumulated, we may confidently say that no safer theological proposition was ever put forth than the Archbishop's. Well might he affirm that "the Sacred Heart of our Lord, being united with the Divinity, is deified,"—or in other words made the Heart of God—"and is therefore an Object of divine worship."

IV.

Having now sufficiently laid our theological foundation, we are in a position to deal with the two

critics whom we have mentioned. Before proceeding however to this work, we will advert to an opinion which has been expressed in the "Spectator" by a writer, who is ever to be mentioned by children of the Church with respect and consideration, because of his earnest desire to deal fairly with her cause. He thinks that, whatever plausible theological defence may be theoretically laid down, unlettered Catholics constantly content themselves with adoring the Sacred Heart, while failing to remember Whose Heart it is. This is one of the instances, by no means unfrequent, in which this excellent writer stumbles, from want of practical acquaintance with Catholic habits; for there is not the most superficial appearance of such a phenomenon as he supposes. But in real truth, if he would but consider, he would see that his charge is a direct contradiction in terms; unless indeed he ascribes to illiterate Catholics (as we are sure he will not) the notion, that an organ of the human body is the Supreme God. How is it so much as metaphysically possible that they can pay divine worship to an organ of the human body, unless either they believe that that organ is the Deity, or else think of it as hypostatically united with God?

Now as regards the writer in the "Guardian" and Dr. Nicholson,—these two assailants by no means take up the same ground with each other: far otherwise. The "Guardian" indeed at first acquiesced in that preposterous interpretation of the Archbishop's word "deified," which Dr. Nicholson originated; but in its very next article on the subject it frankly admitted,

that that particular question was merely one of "language." In other respects, the position of those two Anglicans is mutually contradictory. The "Guardian" avowedly attacked the doctrine inculcated on all Roman Catholics concerning the Sacred Heart; and dealt with the Archbishop's Sermon, as with the genuine indubitable utterance of that doctrine. But it was Dr. Nicholson's direct purpose to allege, that the Archbishop is in flagrant opposition to the theology of his own Church. Our own chief attention shall be given to the writer in the "Guardian."

This critic opposes the adoration of the Sacred Heart, on the ground that Christians are not at liberty to "place the Human Nature of our Lord before their minds" for the purpose of adoration, as "distinct in idea from His Deity"; even though only accounting it "adorable on account of its connection with Him."* The writer, it will be seen, does not

* We have mislaid our copy of the "Guardian" of September 17th, and on applying for another have found that it is out of print. The following however are the words with which the subject is closed on October 1st :—

"This subject is one which, though it may be originated, can scarcely be pursued in a newspaper. However, we feel it due to the authority of our correspondent, signing himself 'A Roman Catholic,' to insert his letter. We also think it fair to print a letter addressed by the Archbishop to the 'Spectator,' and printed by that paper—as well as a letter addressed by Dr. Nicholson to the 'Tablet,' and not printed. They seem to us to leave matters much where they were. The question respecting the word 'deify' has become one of language. The real question at issue we apprehend to be this :—

"A Catholic Council followed by Catholic Doctors pronounces

even allege, that Catholics adore the Sacred Humanity (or again the Sacred Heart) without at the same moment thinking of its union with God the Son as the very motive of their adoration. Indeed, as we said just now in answering the "Spectator," such an allegation would be nothing less than a contradiction in terms; unless he *further* alleged (which on the contrary he disavows) that Roman Catholics actually believe the Sacred Humanity or the Sacred Heart to be the Supreme God. But he says that Christians may

an anathema on those who, instead of adoring one Being at once Human and Divine, give a separate adoration to the Man or Human Nature, and a separate adoration to the Deity or Divine Nature. Nothing is said to except from this anathema a separate adoration of the human nature on account of its connection with the Divine; nothing to suggest a distinction between adoration *in se* and adoration *propter se*. In letter, the condemnation is unqualified.

"This being the Catholic announcement, the question is whether it does not condemn those who place before their minds as an object of Divine worship, distinct in idea from the Deity though of course only adorable on account of its connection with Him, either the Human Nature of our Lord, or, still more and far more, a particular organ of his Human body.

"The Council appears to say that the Human Nature of our Lord, though beyond doubt indissolubly united with the Divine—*is not* on that or any other account a proper object of separate Divine worship.

"Archbishop Manning and our Correspondent plainly say that the Heart of our Lord, being indissolubly connected with the Divine nature, *is* on that account a proper object of such Divine worship as Roman Catholics are encouraged to offer it.

"Whether these two positions are not inconsistent appears to us to be the principal question which arises out of this correspondence, and which we now hand over to theologians."

not lawfully adore ths Sacred Humanity, as distinct *in idea* from the Deity. Why, if we took his words as they stand, we should be obliged to bring against him the very charge of which he acquits Roman Catholics; we should be obliged to charge him with utter ignorance of God. What kind of Deity can it be which he worships, from which he is unable to separate *even in idea* a certain human body and soul? Of course we know that such words are no true expression of his thoughts. But they do show an otherwise incredible confusion of mind on the whole subject; they do show at once a dense ignorance, and a profound unconsciousness of that ignorance, as to what is *meant* by those who speak of adoring Jesus as God. Verily—as "Catholicus" observes (p. 9),—"the subject of the Sacred Heart seems to have been providentially used at this time, that 'the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed.'" Here is a writer, fancying himself to believe the Incarnation, stimulated to vehement protest by that adoration of the Sacred Heart which Catholics practise. And behold, when he comes to explain himself, no other intelligible sense can be given his words, except either (1) that the Deity is not separable in idea from a certain human body and soul; or else (2) that Jesus Christ may not be worshipped as God.

It is natural enough, that one thus bewildered should seek some plausible ground for assailing the doctrine which he dislikes: and the writer before us has caught from Dr. Nicholson the happy notion, that such ground can be discovered in a canon of an

Ecumenical Council. The canon to which he refers (the ninth of the Fifth Council) runs as follows in the Latin text:—

"Si quis adorari in duabus naturis dicit Christum, ex quo duæ adorationes introducuntur semotim Deo Verbo et semotim Homini;—aut si quis ad peremptum carnis aut in confusionem Deitatis et Humanitatis unam naturam sive essentiam convenientium portentosè dicens sic adorat Christum;—sed non unâ adoratione Deum Verbum Incarnatum cum Ejus Carne adorat, juxta quod Sanctæ Dei Ecclesiæ ab initio traditum est;—talis anathema sit."

Here, says the "Guardian," those are expressly anathematized, who do what Catholics do; viz. "worship Christ in two Natures." We do not remember anywhere to have seen a more reckless interpretation. If the writer had taken the pains to read the last clause (as well as the first) of this canon, he would have seen that Catholics are therein exhorted to "worship, with one adoration, God the Incarnate Word together with His Flesh"; or in other words to adore Christ in His two Natures. Now it is not very probable, the writer will admit, that one and the same canon of an Ecumenical Council shall *end* by *inculcating* that practice, which it has *begun* by *anathematizing*. And it is not very unreasonable surely to express our regret, that the writer should not have taken the pains of studying the canon as a whole. Had he done so, he would have found that it may be divided into three clauses. The last of these clauses sets forth the Catholic doctrine, "as it has been deli-

vered to the Catholic Church from the beginning"; the second clause condemns the Eutychian perversion of that doctrine; and the first clause condemns the Nestorian perversion thereof. Now, what is the Nestorian tenet? When Nestorians say that Christ is rightly worshipped in His two Natures, they mean in His two Natures *severally;* in His Divine Nature as Divine, and in His Human Nature as Human. And that this tenet is precisely the one here condemned, is manifest, not only (as we have just shown) by the very necessity of the case, but even demonstratively by the words which next follow. "From which" dictum, proceeds the canon, "two worships are brought in": addressed "separately to God the Word, and separately to the Man." Such a conclusion indubitably follows from the Nestorian tenet, that Christ is rightly adored in His two Natures severally. But on the other hand no such conclusion has the faintest appearance of following from the Catholic dogma, that His Human Nature is rightly adored with latria, and contemplated as the Human Nature of God the Son.*

So much on the "Guardian" writer; whom we have criticised at the greater length, because "Catholicus" does not refer to him. On Dr. Nicholson we shall say very little, as he is of course more properly left in the hands of "Catholicus." For ourselves, we could not attach any meaning whatever to by far the largest

* [I might with advantage have referred, in further illustration of this canon, to S. Cyril's eighth anathematism: which is avowedly directed against Nestorianism.]

portion of his utterances. We saw plainly enough that, with almost incredible simplicity, he ascribed to Archbishop Manning the doctrine, that our Blessed Lord's Heart possesses the attributes of Infinity, Eternity, Omnipresence: an absurdity, in which the "Guardian" at first supported him. "It may seem wonderful" indeed, well says "Catholicus" (Preface, p. ii.), "that Dr. Nicholson should have thought this proposition to be a possible error in a human mind, even of a Romanist." Then as to the word "deify," taken by itself,—it is most intelligible indeed that an unlearned person might misunderstand it: but Dr. Nicholson wrote as one well acquainted with councils and theologians, as one to whom the loftiest summits of theology are familiar; and it is amazing therefore that he should have been in complacent and self-satisfied ignorance of a phrase, which has been so commonly used in every age of the Church in the Archbishop's sense. At the same time, as regards this particular assault on the Archbishop, we were at all events able to understand Dr. Nicholson's meaning. We also understood that he was citing against the Archbishop that canon of the Fifth Council, on which we have been speaking above. But as for all the rest—not only we could not understand what doctrine it was which *he himself* maintained—we could not even understand what doctrine he *charged the Archbishop* with maintaining. On the former of these particulars, "Catholicus" seems as much in the dark as ourselves; but on the latter he has managed, by a perseverance which we cannot

sufficiently admire, to make out what the Archbishop is accused of.

"So far as his letters are comprehensible, the charge ranges over the following heads:

"1. That the Archbishop had declared the Sacred Humanity to be deified; i.e. changed into God; or made 'God.'

"2. That he had separated it from the Divinity and set it up as a deified object of separate worship: a 'quasi God,' as Dr. Nicholson calls it.

"3. That he had thereby taught at one and the same time two heresies, namely, Nestorianism, which makes two Persons in Christ, and that thereby he fell under the anathema of the Fifth General Council; and Eutychianism, which taught that the human nature was so absorbed into the Divine, that there were no longer *two* natures but *one* only in Christ." (Preface, pp. i. ii.)

V.

After all this we are naturally led to inquire, how far Anglicans in general are compromised by such exhibitions of theological unsoundness as we have been considering. "Catholicus" has some remarks on this head.

"We have been hitherto altogether unconscious, and could not have believed, that so much formal Nestorianism and Semi-Arianism could lie hid in the Anglican Church. And when we remember that the 'Guardian' is, by privilege, the paper of the Anglican

clergy, and to be found in a large number of their homes, we feel a profound disappointment. We had hoped better things. We have no pleasure in the errors even of our antagonists. Hitherto we have believed that, in the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and of the Incarnation at least, the Anglican clergy were faithful and well instructed. We are much shaken in this hope by these revelations" (p. 9).

The Archbishop speaks, not inconsistently with this, but perhaps in a somewhat more hopeful spirit:

"A century ago a number of clergymen, who were at heart Unitarians, tried hard to get rid of the Athanasian Creed. In these days this effort has been renewed. Those who have authority have resisted the attempt, and I thank God for it. It is one more barrier in the way of the descent of religion—it is one more bond to hold the Christianity of England from hastening down the rapids which have wrecked the faith of Germany and Switzerland. I speak, therefore, of the Established Church of England so far with hope, and I bear a true affection to multitudes of those who are in it. I believe them to be in good faith. If they knew the light of the truth, they would give their lives for it. They would not for the world speak a syllable to derogate from the glory of the Incarnation. Therefore let nothing I am about to say be understood as reflecting on those whom I honour and love, though they be in error and in separation from the Catholic Church" (p. 7).

For ourselves—as we have often enough expressed in preceding numbers—we have never shared what we must regard as the past illusion of "Catholicus": we have never seen any reason for "hoping better things," than have been manifested by this contro-

versy. It would have always greatly surprised us to find, that so much as one out of five hundred—even among those Anglicans who are most zealous for retaining the Athanasian Creed—have any apprehension whatever of the dogmata of the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation,—we will not say as set forth by Suarez or Lugo or Franzelin,—but as expressed in ordinary text-books. And the circumstances of the controversy before us must have brought round to our way of thinking many Catholics, who had previously been more hopeful than ourselves.

Yet these very Anglicans may be zealous for the doctrine of the Incarnation, according to their own conception of it; nay it may be even true, as the Archbishop thinks, that "they would not for the world speak a syllable to derogate from its glory." At all events we do not ourselves hold, that belief in the Trinity and Incarnation are necessary to salvation "necessitate medii." And our own bias is to hope heartily, with the Archbishop, that "multitudes" both of Anglicans and other Protestants are invincibly ignorant of those verities which they do not know, and that, through their faith in "Deus Unus et Remunerator," they are on the road to heaven.

At the same time the spirit of hostility to Catholicity, which the High Church Anglicans have shown on this occasion, is much greater than we should have expected. Considering all the solemn admonitions they have been good enough to address to Catholics, on the idolatrous tendency of their worship of the

most Holy Virgin,—we should have expected some little recognition of the fact, that the devotion we have defended is at all events cherished by Catholics as a means of expressing intense gratitude for their Redeemer's love. But the "Guardian" at least—and there is no more representative paper—has in no degree been softened by the thought. The facts of this case bear reflecting on again and again. We may be very certain that what the "Guardian" says, many of the more "orthodox" Anglican clergymen will also say. It appears therefore that many of those who criticise so severely the Church's devotions to Mary, as interfering with the primitive loyalty to Jesus,—are found traitors against that very dogma, concerning the adoration due to Jesus, which was elaborated by the Councils and theologians of primitive times.

We should also have thought that some sympathy towards Catholics might have been elicited, by the circumstance of both parties having now to contend against the prevalent irreligion of our time. Even Lord Shaftesbury on a recent occasion "confessed that," in the matter of denominational education, "he sympathized even with the Roman Catholics. Although widely differing from them in religious conviction, he could not but admire the men who declared that their children should not be sent to schools where their great dogmas and doctrines were never heard, and where the Church to which they belonged was looked upon as corrupt and hateful." It is reported too that "cheers" from his friends were elicited by this

declaration.* We do not in general meet with such sympathy, even from the more advanced Anglicans. Observe e. g. the bitter and violent language of the recent "Church Defence tracts," which came out with the expressed sanction of Canon Liddon. Dr. Pusey indeed—we are desirous of bearing testimony to the fact—has in his latest writings entirely abandoned his habit of anti-Roman declamation; but even Dr. Pusey on this occasion seems to have failed in a plain duty. He must have known perfectly well that, as a mere matter of primitive Catholic doctrine, the Archbishop was in the right, and his assailants ludicrously in the wrong. We cannot understand why he did not publicly protest in favour of primitive orthodoxy; and indeed even the more, because its assailants were High-Church Anglicans and its defender a Catholic Archbishop. However opposition is at times the greatest service which can be rendered. And we do not see how two such thinkers as the "Guardian" writer and Dr. Nicholson, could in any other way have effected nearly so much towards promoting the great Catholic devotion of modern times, as they have done by writing from their own peculiar stand-point with a view to its disparagement.

* At a meeting in the St. James's Hall, reported by the "Guardian" of Nov. 12th.

THE RELATIONS OF S. PAUL WITH S. PETER.

The First Age of Christianity and the Church. By JOHN IGNATIUS DOLLINGER, D.D. Translated by HENRY NUTCOMBE OXENHAM, M.A. London: Allen.

S. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. A revised text, with Introduction, Notes, and Illustrations. By J. B. LIGHTFOOT, D.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Cambridge: Macmillan.

[January 1867.]

IN a later article of our present number, we defend against Dr. Pusey the Catholic doctrine of Ecclesiastical Unity. As a foundation of our argument, we draw attention to one fact, so evident on the surface of history, that no one (we suppose) has ever called it in question. The first Christians considered themselves as having received a Divine command, (1) to accept as infallible truth the Apostolic preaching; and (2) to form themselves into one society, under unreserved submission to the Apostolic government. No one therefore, who believes that Christianity is from God, has ever denied that the Apostles did in fact receive this twofold commission. And yet Protestants have at times put forth various statements concerning S. Paul, which would lead by immediate consequence to a directly contrary conclusion. They have implied, e.g., that S. Peter fell into this or that

doctrinal mistake, which S. Paul corrected; and again, that the latter claimed the right of legislating for his own converts, quite independently of the earlier Apostles. Yet the former of these implications is simply an implication that S. Peter was not doctrinally infallible; while from the latter it would at once ensue, that the Church of the Apostles did not constitute one body politic, but, on the contrary, was composed of distinct and independent societies. No Protestant could directly maintain either of these two conclusions; but it is not on that account the less important, carefully to examine those phenomena on which his premisses rest. Then further, in our next number we are to maintain against Dr. Pusey that S. Peter was not merely an Apostle, but the chief of the Apostles; possessing by divine right a certain authority over the rest: and it will be obviously convenient therefore, to take the present opportunity for examining those particulars in S. Paul's history, which Protestants allege against the Catholic doctrine.

The text of the New Testament is common ground between our opponents and ourselves. And in examining it for the purpose in hand, we shall derive great assistance from the two works which we have named at the head of our article. When Mr. Oxenham's translation first appeared, while rendering full justice to the singular merits of Dr. Döllinger's work, we expressed in some detail our sense of what appeared to us its serious defects: but in the present article it will be our more pleasing task to deal almost exclusively with points on which we cordially concur with the

learned writer.* Dr. Lightfoot's Commentary displays a most unusual amount of learning, ability, and candour; and we are very happy to add, that the principles, advocated or implied throughout, are those of the more orthodox among Protestants.†

I.

It so happens that in every case the Protestant disparagement of S. Peter turns on that great doctrine of Christianity, which declares the Ceremonial Law to be utterly abolished. We must begin, therefore, with a brief reference to that doctrine. We do not, of course, profess to treat it with any kind of completeness; but only just so far as is necessary, for appreciating the relationship between S. Peter and S. Paul. According, then, to the view universally received in the Church from the time of S. Augustine, the case stands thus:—The Jewish Ceremonial Law ceased to be obligatory, whenever and wherever the Gospel Law was sufficiently promulgated. From the very day of Pentecost, so soon as the Gospel was sufficiently promulgated to the Jews in any place, the Ceremonial Law ceased to bind them. Yet on the other hand for several years, as theologians express it, it was not *deadly* although *dead*. That is, though the Jews were not *bound* to practise it, yet they were fully *permitted* to do so. There were two different

* [It will be remembered of course that, when this article was written, Dr. Döllinger had not openly broken with the Church.]

† [Dr. Lightfoot is now the Anglican Bishop of Durham.]

reasons for this. Firstly, as Dr. Döllinger observes, so long as the Jewish polity and "Temple stood, it was idle to think of abolishing the Law; or at least its abolition could only have come about through a general and simultaneous entrance of the Jewish nation, as well its lower as its higher classes, into the Church. For the ceremonial was also a civil law; the Jew was bound to its observance not only as an individual, but above all as a member of the state and nation; nor was there any command of the Lord to the individual believer, to separate from His people and its Church and State organization. *Moreover, in Judæa and Galilee it was impossible to do so without emigrating.* . . Thus it was not left to the caprice of the believers in Judæa whether they would observe the Ceremonial Law or not, but was for them a necessity" (vol. i. p. 84). Then, secondly and subordinately, the Jews were in general so obstinately attached to their ritual, that the attempt suddenly and without preparation to have required its abandonment, would have placed a very serious obstacle to their reception of the Gospel. The Apostles, consequently, not only did not command a Jewish convert to abstain from practising the Ceremonial Law; they practised it themselves, for the most part, punctually and diligently. And they carefully abstained from promulgating the doctrine, that its obligation had ceased.

And yet no one who accepts the New Testament can successfully maintain, that after the day of Pentecost they ever regarded this Law and the Jewish Temple-service as permanent institutions; or as con-

stituting an integral part of Christianity. On the one hand it is absolutely incredible that our Lord should have concealed from *them*, what He declared to the Samaritan woman (John iv. 21); not to mention His prophecy on the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple (Matt. xxiv. 2, &c.): and the Holy Ghost, be it observed (John xiv. 26), recalled to their memory whatever He had spoken. On the other hand, as a matter of fact, it is absolutely certain that, some time before S. Peter's Cornelius-vision, the essentially transient character of the Jewish polity was publicly preached by Christians; since it was this very doctrine for which S. Stephen was martyred.* The being

* Acts vi. 13, 14:—"Statuerunt falsos testes qui dicerent 'homo iste non cessat loqui verba adversus locum sanctum et legem; audivimus enim eum dicentem quoniam Jesus Nazarenus hic destruet locum istum, et mutabit traditiones quas tradidit nobis Moyses.'" Dr. Lightfoot beyond doubt is substantially correct in his remark (p. 281), that "the accused attempts no denial, but pleads a justification." Had the charge been simply destitute of all foundation, S. Stephen's defence would have been that he reverenced the Temple and the Law as absolutely and unreservedly as any Hebrew present; but no imaginable analysis of his speech can represent this as its drift. See e.g. vii. 47, 48:—"Salomon autem ædificavit Illi domum, sed non Excelsus in manufactis habitat." That is, to use à Lapide's paraphrase, "Be not proud because of your Temple and its Jewish rites *as though they were to be perpetual*, &c." To the same effect Tirinus: "If anything pricked the Jews to the heart, this last comment concerning the Temple, as though it were not so dear to God, roused them all to the height of frenzy." In what respect then were S. Stephen's accusers "false witnesses"? "They perhaps said nothing but truth," says Calmet (ad locum), "in maintaining that [according to S. Stephen] Jesus had said that *the Temple*

merely told that at some future unknown period Jewish ceremonialism would cease, was of course indefinitely less startling and repulsive to Jewish believers, than the notion that, while the Temple-services remained in full celebration, any children of Abraham could be dispensed from their frequentation and practice. The Apostles meanwhile were mainly occupied in imbuing their flock with a morality which was new to very many, and a Faith which was new to all; they were speaking of God's Eternal Son and Life-giving Spirit; of Redemption, Faith, and Grace. It probably did not occur to them, before the case of Cornelius, even to consider the question, whether the time was come for making that important change, which was inaugurated by his reception into the Church. Nor, be it remembered, did the prevalent restriction, even at that early period, operate necessarily in the way of exclusion; because every human being had full liberty of becoming a proselyte to the Mosaic Law.*

should be destroyed and the ceremonies of the Mosaic Law abolished. But they spoke falsely in saying that [according to S. Stephen] Jesus would *Himself* destroy the Temple." Similarly, Menochius. The charge was further and more importantly false, as Dr. Lightfoot truly remarks (p. 281), in that it totally "misrepresents the spirit which animated S. Stephen's teaching." There can be no doubt that he referred most reverently to the Temple and Ceremonial Law, as having been of Divine institution. But whereas he also preached that they had not been instituted as *permanent*, he was falsely charged with "speaking against" them. Cf. the "false witnesses" against our Lord.

* Suarez, in his "de Legibus" (l. 9, c. 15–20), draws out powerfully the full doctrine, as to the Ceremonial Law becoming firstly "mortua" and afterwards "mortifera." He assumes throughout,

II.

We are not aware that Protestants in general will demur to any portion of the above sketch; though they represent S. Peter as more or less confused and uncertain, as to one or two further truths built by God on this foundation. Our most convenient course then will be to trace, under Dr. Lightfoot's guidance, the successive stages along which the Church proceeded, in applying to practice the fundamental Christian doctrine, that no believer is obliged to comply with the Jewish Ceremonial Law. At each successive stage, we will consider the position assumed by S. Peter and the earlier Apostles.

The first disciples consisted of four classes: (1) those who were Jewish by descent and lived in Judæa; (2) those who were Jewish by descent, but who were dispersed over the world, though in the habit of visiting Jerusalem for the Pasch; (3) those who were descended from "proselytes"; and (4) those who were themselves proselytes. All these were circumcised, and kept the whole Ceremonial Law; yet the Hebrews proper had ever regarded the "Hellenists"*

as a matter of course, that the Apostles knew from the very day of Pentecost the cessation of its obligatoriness. He does not however advert at all to that necessity of observing it, which resulted (as Dr. Döllinger points out) from the law of the land. Moreover, Suarez himself inclines to name a considerably earlier period than the destruction of the Temple, as the epoch at which it became "mortifera." We do not ourselves see our way to follow him in this particular.

* "The Hellenists were the Grecian Jews: not only those who

with suspicion and distrust. "As the number of disciples increased" (Acts vi. 1), this mutual estrangement found an entrance into the Church; and it happened, either that the interest of the Hellenist widows was comparatively neglected in the daily distribution of alms, or else that the Hellenists themselves unjustly suspected this. The Apostles (ver. 4) desiring to apply themselves without distraction to their more spiritual duties, begged the brethren at large to select seven deacons for the care of the poor. "All the names of the seven" thus selected "are Greek, pointing to a Hellenist rather than a Hebrew extraction; and one," Nicolaus, "is especially described as a proselyte, being doubtless chosen to represent a hitherto small but growing section of the community." (Lightfoot, p. 280.) Even in this fact, we find S. Peter and his co-Apostles steadily resisting any undue pre-eminence of that class to which they themselves belonged.

Next follows the martyrdom of S. Stephen, one of the seven, for proclaiming the transitory character of the Temple and the Ceremonial Law. Nothing can be plainer, than that the Apostles and whole Christian body considered themselves absolutely identified with

were themselves proselytes,—not only those who came of families once proselytized,—but all who, on account of origin or habitation, *spoke Greek* as their ordinary language, and *used ordinarily the Septuagint version.*" (Alford ad Acts vi. 1.) It is to be regretted that the Vulgate uses the same word, "Græci," for such different classes as the Ἑλληνισταί and the Ἕλληνες. Acts viii. 1—7; xi. 19.

S. Stephen's cause. He had but proclaimed what the Apostles commissioned him to proclaim.

"The indirect consequences of his martyrdom extend far beyond the immediate effect of his dying words. A persecution arose about Stephen. The disciples of the mother Church 'were scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judæa and Samaria (viii. 1).' Some of the refugees even 'travelled as far as Phœnice and Cyprus and Antioch' (xi. 19). This dispersion was, as we shall see, the parent of the first Gentile congregation. The Church of the Gentiles, it may be truly said, was baptized in the blood of Stephen." (Lightfoot, p. 281.) "The great persecution in Jerusalem dispersed most of the believers over the provinces of Judæa and Samaria, and even drove them further to Phœnicia, Cyprus, and Antioch. *That the Apostles, who were chiefly threatened, remained at Jerusalem, showed that they had received a special command of Christ to do so.*" (Döllinger, p. 68.)

We now arrive at an extremely important step in the Church's denationalization; the conversion of Samaria. "The Samaritan occupied the border land between the Jew and the Gentile. Theologically, as geographically, he was the connecting link between the one and the other. Half Hebrew by race, half Israelite in the acceptance of a portion of the sacred canon, he held an anomalous position, shunning and shunned by the Jew, yet clinging to the same promises and looking forward to the same hopes." (Lightfoot, p. 282.) How did the Apostles receive the intelligence, that multitudes of these men had received Baptism?

with disapprobation? with misgiving? On the contrary—since Philip had not the power of imparting the visible gifts of the Holy Ghost—the Apostles at once commissioned SS. Peter and John to ratify and complete the holy work which Philip had begun. (Acts viii. 14—17.)

Matters at length became ripe for a still more important and significant movement; the admission of Gentiles as such into the one fold, without any necessity for their taking the intermediate step, and becoming proselytes to Judaism. If we may so speak, God inaugurated this great epoch by a solemn ceremonial; nor did He assign to S. Peter the task of approving and completing what had been done by a subordinate, but on the contrary of Himself beginning, carrying through, and accomplishing the inaugural act. He learned by a vision (Acts x. 10—16), that the appointed time was now come; that whereas under the old Covenant "the Supreme Lawgiver had marked out and given for food only certain classes of animals" (Döllinger, p. 71), the time was now come when all animals were indifferently to be eaten within the borders of the Church.* Then entered

* Dr. Döllinger apparently considers (p. 72) that S. Peter did not know, before this vision, even so much as this; viz., that the Ceremonial Law was no permanent and integral portion of Christianity. Not here to dwell on other extremely strong grounds of objection against this opinion, it is surely altogether irreconcilable (1) with S. Stephen's preaching, and (2) with S. Peter's own approval of the Samaritan conversions. S. Peter's words indeed (Acts x. 34, 35) are understood by Dr. Döllinger as imposing this view; but, we are convinced, untruly. S. Peter says, "In veritate

the messengers of Cornelius, who had himself been favoured with a similar vision; and S. Peter, now understanding the significance of what he had seen, gladly accompanied them. "And now followed an

comperi (ἐπ' ἀληθείας καταλαμβάνομαι) quia non est personarum acceptor Deus; sed in omni gente qui timet Eum et operatur justitiam acceptus est Illi": which Dr. Döllinger understands as meaning, "*Now for the first time I discover*, &c." But (1) how monstrously unworthy the supposition, that an inspired Apostle can have been commissioned to teach on faith and grace, without knowing so elementary a truth, as that all truly good men are acceptable to God! Moreover (2) Dr. Döllinger strangely forgets, that the very Apostolic commission was "Euntes docete omnes gentes." On coming to the facts of this particular case, Dr. Döllinger's mistake seems to us equally evident. It is simply impossible that S. Peter could express himself as having *at that moment discovered* that men of all nations are admitted into the Church: for even an Æthiopian had just been received (Acts viii. 38); and one of the very deacons was a proselyte. Secondly, as Dean Alford (ad locum) points out, S. Peter is referring to three passages of Scripture, Deut. x. 17; 2 Paralip. xix. 7; Job xxxiv. 19; where it is said that God does not accept persons. Could S. Peter have meant "now for the first time I believe what Scripture says"? Nor can we see any verbal difficulty in understanding the words, with Calmet, "I now experience what I already speculatively knew"; or, again, with Dean Alford, "I grasp by experience the truth of what Scripture declares." We would suggest some such paraphrase as this: "In this vision I apprehend (or recognize) nothing less, than that great truth declared in Scripture, &c." The Vulgate, by translating "comperi" instead of "comperio," seems to protest against the interpretation which we are opposing.

We should further add, that Dr. Döllinger greatly increases his own difficulty, by supposing (p. 68) that the converted Æthiopian was only a "proselyte *of the gate*"—i.e., a person in every respect similarly circumstanced with Cornelius himself. Had this been so, Dr. Döllinger's view would not be unreasonable only, but quite without meaning, that S. Peter did not, before his vision, know

occurrence which could not but remove the last lingering scruples of S. Peter's Jewish attendants. God Himself showed that He had made these Gentiles members of Christ, independently of the ministry of the Apostle who was summoned for the purpose. For, before they were baptized and had received the laying on of hands, while they were listening to S. Peter's words, the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they spoke with tongues and praised God. Thus was the same privilege accorded to the first fruits of the Gentiles, which had been the glory of the first fruits of Israel at Pentecost. They were at once baptized by Peter's direction; and thus God had Himself reversed in some sense the usual order of His grace, by bestowing on the unbaptized the gifts of the Holy Ghost. . . . When the believers at Jerusalem received Peter with reproaches for having associated and eaten with the uncircumcised, he justified himself by simply relating what had occurred, which showed clearly the immediate interposition of God, and by reminding them of Christ's promise, that His followers should be baptized with the Holy Ghost, which was here fulfilled." (Döllinger, pp. 72, 73.) They received his account of what had passed with great gladness and thanksgiving. Nothing had occurred to give them any suspicion, that *the children of Abraham* were no longer bound by the Ceremonial Law. They only discovered, and rejoiced

the admissibility of such persons into the Church. But we cannot ourselves doubt, that the Æthiopian was an observer of the whole Ceremonial Law; a "proselyte of righteousness." — See Esa. lvi. 3-5.

to discover, that Gentiles could now freely enter the Church, without being checked by any previous obligation of becoming proselytes to Judaism.

Very soon afterwards a still further step was taken. Cornelius was a pious Monotheist, and a believer in the Old Testament; but at Antioch a multitude of idolatrous Gentiles were converted (Acts xi. 20).* In

* There is some little dispute here about the facts, on which a few words may be in place. Is the word in ver. 20 Ἕλληνες or Ἑλληνιστάι? The Vulgate throws no light on the question, because it translates both these words by the same name "Græci." Both à Lapide and Calmet understand the verse as referring to idolatrous Gentiles; nor do we see how the context admits of any doubt. At first the word was preached by the dispersed Christians "to none except Jews alone" (ver. 19); whereas in Antioch it was afterwards also preached to the "Græci." Now, no one can suppose that at first it was preached to a *narrower* class, than at Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost; hence at Antioch afterwards it was preached to a *larger* class. The "Græci" therefore were not Hellenists; and, if not Hellenists, they were idolatrous Gentiles.

The great objection against this obvious view, is the alleged impossibility of supposing that such an event can have taken place before the conversion of Cornelius. And no one indeed, who accepts the New Testament, can reasonably admit that that conversion would have been attended with so much of miracle and of ceremonial, had *idolatrous Gentiles* been already reclaimed and received into the Church. But on what possible ground are the events of Acts xi. 20 to be placed before Cornelius's conversion? As soon as they took place, they must have been reported at Jerusalem; as soon as they were reported, the Apostles sent S. Barnabas to Antioch (ver. 22); when he arrived at Antioch, S. Paul was at Tarsus (ver. 25); and S. Paul did not arrive at Tarsus till more than three years after his conversion (Gal. i. 18; Acts ix. 30). The obvious interpretation then of these events is as follows. After S. Stephen's martyrdom, many Christians spent much time in Cyprus, Phœnice, and Antioch, preaching to those of the Circum-

what spirit did the Apostles receive this new intelligence? They at once sent down S. Barnabas (ver. 22), who, acting under the instructions he had received, took the best means in his power to consolidate and edify this infant Gentile Church. No unprejudiced person would dream of otherwise understanding the sacred narrative. Dean Alford however, whose great general services as a Scripture commentator we are far from undervaluing, gives so truly extraordinary a turn to the whole circumstance, that we can only attribute his interpretation to the unconscious influence of Protestant and anti-Petrine prejudice. He says (on Acts xi. 21) that the Apostles probably sent S. Barnabas "to *deter* these persons from admitting the uncircumcised into the Church." And what reason does the learned author assign for so strange a paradox? He says it is implied in verses 23, 24, that S. Barnabas on his arrival found the state of Antioch most different from what he had expected. We fancy no one except the Dean would have dreamed of any

cision. In due time intelligence arrived of Cornelius's conversion and of its attendant circumstances. Now, if a *pious Monotheist* could be received into the Church without first becoming a Jewish proselyte, an *idolatrous Gentile* might also be received into the Church on due conditions: for in the very process of his conversion he must rise to Cornelius's original position, that of a pious Monotheist. Certain zealous Cyprians and Cyrenæans then saw that this principle was involved in what S. Peter had done, and proceeded at once to preach with great success to the idolatrous Gentiles at Antioch. And it is most intelligible that, Hellenists as they probably were, they should be much quicker than Hebrews to discern the full significance of S. Peter's act.

such implication; but let us, for argument's sake, concede it. Under S. Barnabas's supposed circumstances, what would have been the conduct of any ordinarily conscientious man? He would at once have returned to the Apostles, reported his experience, and begged for fresh instructions. But, according to the Dean, he at once resolved on a course precisely opposed to that which he had been ordered to adopt, and brought S. Paul to Antioch as the best coadjutor he could find in his perfidy and rebellion. Nay, Dean Alford thinks that the sacred historian, in the very act of describing so shameful a scandal, described its perpetrator (ver. 24) as "a good man and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith." Dr. Lightfoot is unhappily not a Catholic, but he is possessed of common sense; and he gives the obvious view of this whole transaction, by saying that, "*at the bidding of the Apostles*, Barnabas seeks out Saul in his retirement at Tarsus, and brings him to Antioch" (p. 285).

We find then, that the whole comprehensiveness of the Church—down to her very reception of idolatrous Gentiles—was wrought, either by the direct agency of the earlier Apostles, or at least under their direction and most hearty co-operation. And we find further, that all this was wrought, before S. Paul had even become an Apostle.

III.

We now turn our attention to the illustrious Doctor of the Gentiles. The original commission given to

the Apostles was, "Euntes, docete omnes gentes"; yet S. Paul was chosen at a later period by God Himself, for the purpose of fulfilling that precept in a far more important and permanent way than all the rest put together. To fit him for his office, God gave him his profound knowledge of the Faith by immediate revelation, and through no agency whatever of the earlier Apostles. Moreover, God raised him up for the purpose of watching with special jealousy against any practical infraction of that great principle of Gospel liberty, which was so necessary for the success of his peculiar mission. Yet,—though such was his high vocation, and though he was himself throughout most keenly conscious how great a trust God had committed to his keeping,—no careful student of his history will find the slightest trace of what so many Protestants suppose; the slightest trace of his claiming either (1) any superiority of doctrinal knowledge over S. Peter and the rest, or (2) any power of government independent of his union with *them*. He co-operated with them in teaching the *whole* Church, in governing the *whole* Church; he never dreamed of individually teaching and governing a special Pauline Church of his own.

Indeed from the first God carefully provided against any idea, that S. Paul's exceptional *vocation* implied any exceptional ecclesiastical *position*. Christ did not Himself baptize him, as He baptized the earlier Apostles; but sent Ananias, an humble and unknown member of the Church, to minister that sacrament (Acts ix. 18). Ananias, at the same time, informed

him in general terms (Acts xxii. 15) of those general circumstances in his future career, which Ananias had himself learned from Christ (Acts ix. 15). The new convert at once simply united himself with the other Christians of Damascus, and preached Jesus, while he was permitted, in the synagague of the city. "Not for long however—that the Jews at Damascus, where they had full power against an apostate from their own ranks, would not have tolerated." Nor indeed was it God's design, that he should at once plunge into those active labours, which were to be the main business of his life. When driven from Damascus, he "did not return to Jerusalem, but went into Arabia" (Gal. i. 17): "not to preach there, but to prepare in solitary intercourse with God for the duties of his future life, to obtain through converse with his glorified Redeemer that fitness for the Apostolate, which the other Apostles had gained from their converse with Christ on earth." (Döllinger, p. 77.) Nor can we doubt that, during that whole period, he was constantly growing in deeper knowledge and apprehension of that Gospel which he was to proclaim. At length however, the needful time of preparation was accomplished; he resumed his labours at Damascus for a brief space;* and when driven thence, three years after his conversion (Gal. i. 18), by the Jewish conspiracy against him (Acts ix. 23), his very first task (Acts ix. 26; Gal. i. 18) was to put himself into commnnication with S. Peter, the Church's visible

* The "dies multi" of Acts ix. 23 include, of course, his long stay in Arabia.

head. Observe, also, the strength of the word "ἱστορῆσαι" (Gal. i. 18), for which "videre" is but an inadequate version. The word, says Dr. Lightfoot (ad loc.), "is somewhat emphatic; 'a word used,' says Chrysostom, 'by those who go to see great and famous cities.'" He went then to visit Peter, as wishing to make acquaintance with—to consult with—the Church's most illustrious member. And whereas modern infidels say that the Acts were written for the purpose of giving an unduly Petrine colour to S. Paul's history, it is remarkable that it is from his own Epistle, and not from the Acts, that we learn what was his chief motive at this period in repairing to Jerusalem.

We find however from the latter work, that he earnestly sought to be identified with the other Christians of Jerusalem; and that whatever repulsion or suspicion existed, came entirely from their side (Acts ix. 26). There seems indeed every reason to think, that his intention at that time was to remain at Jerusalem, labouring under SS. Peter and James, until they should see good to employ him in more distant missions. But when the Hellenistic Jews sought his life (ix. 29), the other Christians themselves recommended a departure to his native Tarsus. At the same time (Acts xxii. 17—21), he was also admonished by Christ, in a vision, to leave Jerusalem; and to hold himself in readiness for a future mission, which should not be to the Jews but to the Gentiles. He would learn more definitely from that vision, than

from Ananias's previous announcement, the precise nature of the work to which he was destined; and he proceeded at once to Tarsus, having remained in Jerusalem only fifteen days (Gal. i. 18). During his brief stay at Tarsus he seems to have remained wholly inactive, awaiting the promised summons. Up to this period then at all events,—true though it is that, having learned the Gospel from God, he needed and received no human instruction,—it is no less true, that no man could have been more simply loyal and submissive to the Apostles.

At Tarsus there very soon reached him that Apostolic commission, brought by S. Barnabas, to which we have already referred. S. Peter and the rest well knew that he had been specially chosen for evangelizing the Gentiles; and they discerned, in the new movement at Antioch, that very scope which was most suited to his graces and endowments. S. Barnabas, a Cyprian, was also singularly well adapted for the same work; and the two friends, assisted by a body of zealous co-operators, reaped a very large harvest of souls in the space of one year (Acts xi. 26). At that time they returned for a brief space to Jerusalem, bringing with them large pecuniary help from the new Gentile community to their Jewish fellow-Christians, who were suffering from famine; and thus expressing their sense of complete religious brotherhood. It would seem however, from S. Paul's subsequent language (Gal. ii. 1), that no Apostle happened to be in Jerusalem at that particular time. (See Dr.

Lightfoot, p. 113.) They returned speedily to Antioch, taking back with them S. Barnabas's nephew S. Mark (Acts xii. 25).

IV.

At this period of S. Paul's history took place his elevation to the Apostolate. This appointment undoubtedly did not come from S. Peter and the others; because, as Dr. Döllinger truly remarks (p. 82), they had received no power from God to create a new Apostle. Yet as though for the purpose of more carefully impressing on him his indissoluble connection with the existing Church, and so with the earlier Apostles,—his appointment seems not to have been directly notified to him by the Holy Ghost, but only through the intermediate agency of certain Antiochene prophets and doctors (Acts xiii. 1). S. Barnabas was at the same time raised to the Apostolic office. From this time the special connection of SS. Paul and Barnabas with the local Church of Antioch came to an end; and moreover, instead of being *commissioned* by (or, as Catholics would now say, receiving *jurisdiction* from) the Apostles, they were themselves members of the Apostolic body. They at once undertook a missionary journey to Cyprus and the southern provinces of Asia Minor, which had great results, but which has no bearing on our present question. It is only necessary to remind the reader, that S. Paul now began what remained throughout his undeviating custom; viz., that of preaching in every place to the

Jews, before he proceeded to address the Gentiles. On his return however to Antioch, began the most critical period of his Christian life.

Before entering on the history of this momentous crisis, it will be necessary to recount briefly the various forms of Judaizing error which then existed. And in the first place very many thoroughly loyal children of the Church fully believed that *they*, as being Jews, were under an obligation of observing the Ceremonial Law. Such were those "thousands" mentioned by S. James to S. Paul (Acts xxi. 20), who were "zealots for the law." The Apostles (as we have already said) carefully abstained from promulgating the contradictory doctrine. At the same time it is perfectly consistent with this statement to admit, that those whose faith was more vigorous—who with more simple docility applied themselves to catch the full spirit of what the Apostles practically taught—would be pretty sure before long to discover that no such obligation existed. We do not however by any means apply this remark in its full extent to the Hebrew Christians of Palestine, isolated as they were and breathing an exclusively Jewish atmosphere: but far more emphatically to the Jewish members of Gentile Churches; of Rome, Corinth, or Philippi. Accordingly S. Paul does not hesitate to call a Christian "weak in the faith," who has still scruples on the Jewish law of meats; though he strictly forbids others to speak of such a man with censure or disrespect.*

* Rom. xiv. 1, 3. See Dr. Murray "de Ecclesia," d. 6, n. 362-8.

The most extreme error on the Judaizing side was that which first disturbed the Antiochene Church (Acts xv. 1); viz., that the observance of the Ceremonial Law is required of all Christians, Jewish or Heathen, as requisite for salvation. Dr. Döllinger points out very justly (p. 85) that "this was going beyond even the prevalent Jewish view of the period." Yet it arose naturally enough: for these men persuaded themselves that this Law is an integral part of the Church's Gospel; and all of course admitted that Church-membership was requisite for salvation. This extreme error, after the Council of Jerusalem, became an expressly condemned heresy. But there seems no doubt that in the previous period it was not actually heretical; for the "much inquiry" mentioned in Acts xv. 7 shows that no direct and general promulgation had hitherto taken place of the contradictory doctrine. At that earlier period therefore, such "false brethren" (Gal. ii. 4) were to be ranked with the class which is next to be considered.

There were many Jewish converts then in S. Paul's time—corresponding to what would now be called "bad Catholics"—who held very serious errors, though short of that actually condemned. These men were filled with a fanatical and passionate love for the Mosaic ritual; and animated by that frightful pride, both national and personal, which was so characteristic of the Pharisaic Jew. They could not endure to entertain the thought, that the superiority of Jew over Gentile had come to an end; and they clung therefore

to a fond belief, that those Gentiles, who did not choose to acknowledge Jewish supremacy by keeping the Ceremonial Law, formed a separate and inferior nationality (so to speak) within the Church. In accordance with this, they held that Jewish observances, though not actually commanded by God to all, were nevertheless most efficacious methods for conciliating His especial favour. Now, as will presently be shown, nothing could be more opposed than all this to S. Peter's and S. James's teaching; still, it does not directly contradict their formal pronouncement. If S. Paul's language was too explicit and emphatic to admit of being misunderstood, these men took refuge in the persuasion, that he was not an Apostle in the same full sense with the three "pillars": drawing this monstrous inference, from the Church's universally received doctrine, that S. Peter's ecclesiastical position was higher even than his. If it was clear—as undoubtedly it was most clear—that the earlier Apostles expressed towards him the fullest agreement and sympathy, this was explained by the supposition that he carefully concealed from those Apostles his real teaching. Possibly enough, many of these men may have even been exempted from mortal sin against faith, by that invincible ignorance which resulted from their Jewish prejudice. However this may be, they certainly inflicted on the great Apostle the keenest pangs of grief, anxiety, perplexity; while on the other hand they afforded him an opportunity of exhibiting to future ages in the most touching light those most

noble qualities, which graced his singularly affecting and attractive character.*

We are now to consider the facts recorded in Acts xv. Nor is it too much to say that these facts, on their very surface and before entering into any detail whatever, are absolutely conclusive on our side of the present controversy. According to the implication of Protestants, S. Paul had received from God a commission to teach and govern his own flock, independently and irrespectively of the earlier Apostles. On such a supposition, what would have been his course when these Jewish teachers arrived at Antioch? He would have simply appealed to his indefeasible commission from God; and he would have warned his disciples against the solicitation of Judaizers, just as he might have warned them against that of heathens or of profligates. Facts are critically and precisely the reverse. He at once sees that no time is to be lost in communicating with his co-Apostles, and in promulgating an united decree on the vital issue which has arisen. In one word, he took that course which, if Catholic doctrine be true, was alone reasonable; but which, on the Protestant hypothesis, was a treacherous surrender of the trust reposed in him by God.

Before entering in detail on the facts, we must inquire whether Acts xv. and Gal. ii. refer to the same

* We know of no other writer who treats S. Paul with that keen insight and sympathetic appreciation, which distinguish F. Newman's various disquisitions on his character. See e.g. "Occasional Sermons."

visit. The question indeed is absolutely immaterial to our argument; but we must of necessity adopt one or other alternative, in order to exhibit the facts at all. We shall assume then the identity of these two visits; of which indeed we have ourselves no doubt whatever.* We will first state the facts, as they result from a combination of the two narratives; and we will not fail afterwards to consider carefully (what Protestants think their strong point) S. Paul's own account of, and reflection on, those facts.

Hardly then had SS. Paul and Barnabas returned to Antioch, when certain Christians arrived from Judæa, declaring, without the slightest warrant (Acts xv. 24), that the older Apostles enjoined circumcision on all converts as necessary to salvation. S. Paul, having learned the Gospel not from these older Apostles but from God Himself, and being well aware that they had enjoyed the self-same privilege, knew with absolute certainty that this allegation was false. He perceived at once however, that he must, without any delay, confer with his co-Apostles; since, if an impression once prevailed of discrepancy between his doctrine and theirs, his labours, both past and prospective, might be rendered fruitless (Ne fortè, &c., Gal. ii. 2). The other authorities at Antioch were similarly impressed (Acts xv. 2); nay, Christ Himself by a special revelation commanded the same course (Gal. ii. 2).

* Dr. Lightfoot states the reasons for this conclusion very clearly and convincingly (pp. 109–114); and we believe it has been far the more common, both in ancient and modern times. Dr. Döllinger also adopts it (p. 86).

He and S. Barnabas therefore at once proceeded to Jerusalem, taking with them in their train S. Titus (Gal. ii. 3) and various others (Acts xv. 2). They passed through Phœnice and Samaria, proclaiming as they went the Gospel's glorious spread, and gladdening all pious hearts with the intelligence (Acts xv. 3). On arriving at Jerusalem, they were eagerly received by the three Apostles and by the elders, and poured forth into their ears the momentous intelligence which they had to communicate.

Those Judaizers who had been in Antioch arrived at Jerusalem about the same time; and, in company with others of the same class, clamoured that the new converts should be compelled to submit to circumcision and the Ceremonial Law (Acts xv. 5). The great body of believers would see at once the vital importance of this issue, and would eagerly cross-question the new-comers; they would also debate the matter among themselves with the keenest interest, with much perplexity, and possibly with some heat. Meanwhile S. Paul, with whom the Three had hitherto possessed very little personal acquaintance, conferred with them privately (Gal. ii. 2). They discovered on examination, as S. Paul well knew would be the case, that his knowledge of the Gospel was fully equal to their own; that nothing remained which they could add to it (Gal. ii. 6).* So far indeed from it,—they saw plainly from his communications, that God had specially charged him with the work of preaching to the Gentiles; just

* This is unquestionably the meaning of "προσανέθεντο," as will be presently shown.

as He had specially charged S. Peter with that of preaching to the Jews (Gal. ii. 7). Thereupon they gave in their full submission to this Divine appointment; and decided that he and S. Barnabas should continue labouring among the former, while they gave themselves to the latter.* "At the same time whatever communities SS. Paul and Barnabas might found, were to be connected with the Church at Jerusalem; and testify their relation to it as daughters, by sending contributions for the poor there." (Döllinger, p. 88.) And to this, as we see in many parts of his epistles, S. Paul did in fact bestow constant attention.

Before we proceed to the subsequent history, we will point out in the above certain faint intimations of S. Peter's Primacy. Thus (1) S. Paul was specially appointed by Christ as Doctor of the Gentiles; and yet it was S. Peter, and *not* S. Paul, who had employed "the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven" to open the doors for their admission. Then (2) S. Paul himself always ascribes to the Jews a certain superiority over the Gentiles; and invariably (as has been already mentioned) preached first to them in every place. It would appear then, that "the Apostle of the Circumcision" has a certain precedence over "the Apostle of the Uncircumcision." (3) It is by the older Apostles,

* "This did not hinder Paul from labouring with unwearied zeal to win his countrymen to faith in Christ, or withdraw Peter and John from preaching to the Gentiles when opportunity offered. All communities already founded, or now growing up, beyond the limits of Judæa, were composed of both Jews and Gentiles, so that every Apostle who did not remain in Judæa, like James, must attend to both."—*Döllinger*, p. 88.

and not by S. Paul, that the ecclesiastical arrangement was proposed, which assigned to each Apostle his respective sphere. On the other hand (4) S. Peter's precedence over SS. John and James is involved in the fact, that to him, and not to them, is committed the Apostolate of the Circumcision; and this, though S. James was actually Bishop of Jerusalem. Lastly (5) whereas S. Paul expressly calls S. Peter "the Apostle of the Circumcision"; elsewhere (Rom. xv. 8) he calls our Lord by the appellation, so strikingly similar, "the Minister of the Circumcision." And it is obvious to remark, that, just as Jesus Christ was not the less Lord and Redeemer of the whole Church, though specially Minister of the Circumcision,—so S. Peter also need be none the less Ruler over the whole Church, though in a special sense Apostle of the Circumcision.

To proceed. Very soon afterwards a larger Congress assembled (Acts xv. 6), consisting of the five Apostles and the Jerusalem elders. On this occasion, doubtless, the Apostles delivered their concurrent testimony on the Christian dogma; all the various facts and bearings of the question were carefully investigated; and a practical conclusion arrived at. It was resolved that a public assembly of Christians should be summoned.* At this assembly two pronouncements were to be

* S. Luke's narrative by itself includes two different meetings. For (1) "the Apostles and elders met together to see about this matter" (verse 6); and (2) after S. Peter's speech "*the whole multitude* was silent" (verse 12). And the final assent was given (verse 22) by "the Apostles, and elders, and *whole Church*."

publicly made; a doctrinal decision, and a disciplinary enactment: though the latter was to include indeed the emphatic enforcement of an admitted and most prominent principle in Christian morality. The doctrinal decision was to be suitably pronounced by S. Peter,* and with this the public proceedings were to commence. The multitude of believers, then, having come together—and the lively interchange of opinion having continued to the last moment—S. Peter at length rose up among them (Acts xv. 7). The terms of the doctrinal judgment which he delivered are very remarkable; and had S. Paul delivered it instead of S. Peter, Protestants would, doubtless, have dwelt on them as proving S. Paul's superior enlightenment. He reminds his hearers of what they well knew—the circumstanees of Cornelius's conversion; and he speaks with some severity of those who had failed to see, that by those circumstances God had really decided the question. "Why do ye *tempt God*," he says, by persistent Judaizing? We would ask moreover, when did *S. Paul* ever use language, concerning the Ceremonial Law in itself, so harsh as S. Peter's declaration (verse 10), that it was a yoke "which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear"? Then further,

* Protestants are fond of alleging that S. James occupied a more authoritative place in this Council than S. Peter. Nothing but the blindness of prejudice can account for so strange a misapprehension; and we are glad to find Dean Alford frankly admitting (ad verse 7) that S. Peter took the more prominent part on this occasion. He explains this (1) by "the *universal deference* paid to him," and (2) by his past history in the matter of Cornelius.

though he does not expressly condemn those lesser Judaizing errors which we recounted above, yet such language as we have cited tends, in drift and spirit, most urgently against them. Lastly, he uses S. Paul's favourite words of "grace" and "faith," just as S. Paul might have used them (verses 9, 11). "You were justified by faith," says S. Paul: "the Gentiles' hearts have been purified by faith," says S. Peter. "How Pauline is S. Peter's speech!" will be the exclamation of many a Protestant: "how Petrine is S. Paul's doctrine!" will be the Catholic's far more reasonable comment. Dr. Lightfoot most gratuitously refers the "Pauline" tone of S. Peter's first Epistle—which certainly cannot be denied—to S. Paul's personal influence over his mind (p. 330). But at this early period no one can allege the existence of any such influence; and yet S. Peter's language is the very same. Since Dr. Lightfoot admits the Apostles to have been inspired, what is that strange difficulty which prevents him from imagining it possible, that "One and the same Spirit" may have deeply imbued different minds with one and the same doctrine?*

It is next relevant to point out, how subordinate a place in the public proceedings was held, whether by S. Paul or S. James, as compared with S. Peter. When the latter had finished speaking, the voice of controversy was no longer heard (verse 12); and the whole multitude gave attentive ear to SS. Paul and

* We much regret to find in Dr. Döllinger similar language: vol. i. p. 134.

Barnabas, while they recounted those astounding marvels which God had wrought through their instrumentality. S. James's address, which followed, consisted of two different points. Firstly, he conciliated the Hebrews, who were his especial flock, by pointing out how clearly the heathens' vocation had been prophesied in the Old Testament itself. Secondly, he announced those regulations which it had been resolved to impose on the Gentile converts. "In order to facilitate a real fusion of Jews and Gentiles in the Church, the latter were to abstain from certain things peculiarly repulsive to the Jews; viz., from sharing in heathen sacrificial feasts, and eating blood or the flesh of strangled animals. The Apostles felt the more bound to require the observance of these restrictions, as it was a matter causing offence to the Jews, and making Christianity appear to them a religion beset with heathen abominations. It was thought necessary in Jerusalem to add the prohibition of "fornication"; because impurity and sins of the flesh were so common and so little regarded among the heathen, that much of this sort might also survive among converts from heathenism."* (Döllinger, p. 87.) The purely disciplinary portion of this enactment was not intended to be permanent; we may even see pretty clearly that it was not intended, even at the time, to be universal. (See Estius ad 1 Cor. x. 30. See also Dr. Lightfoot's excellent remarks in pp. 289,

* Acts xv. Gal. ii. 1—10.

290.) But as the matter is wholly irrelevant to our argument, we pass it over.*

* [As supplementary to what is said in the text, I insert the following passage from a later article.

"There is no portion of Scripture history, from which Protestants have derived so many objections to S. Peter's Primacy, as from the Judaizing controversy. These objections chiefly concern the relations between him and S. Paul; and we devoted an article in January to their detailed refutation. One remains to be considered here; because it is founded on the position, not of S. Paul, but of S. James. We will begin by stating it at the best advantage:—'If S. Peter had possessed a Primacy of authority, it is 'quite impossible that S. James, not he, should have presided at 'the Council of Jerusalem, and promulgated the Apostolic Decree. 'But S. James assuredly did occupy this place. It was he who 'finally summed up the proceedings, and pronounced the "ego 'judico" (xv. 19) which was carried into effect.'

"The objection possesses on the surface much plausibility; but it is at once dissipated when you look closely at facts. Its fallacy consists in its ignoring the circumstance, that there were *two* Apostolic pronouncements; viz. (1) the Definition of faith, and (2) the disciplinary Decree. S. Peter very suitably uttered the former, and S. James very suitably uttered the latter. 'Ego judico' undoubtedly means, as the objector alleges, 'I judge in my own name and that of my brethren'; 'I pronounce the Apostolic judgment': but then this judgment was not doctrinal but disciplinary. If one may indulge in conjecture, it would seem far more probable than not, that it was S. James who proposed this measure at the preliminary meeting. At all events his position, as specially representing the Jewish element in the Church, made it obviously suitable that *he* should pronounce, what had been decreed in *protection* of the Jewish Christians. But if you look carefully at his speech, you will find that, so far from professing to promulgate a definition of faith, on the contrary he rather refers (verse 14) to S. Peter as having already done so. While on the other hand so soon as S. Peter had spoken, 'tacuit omnis multitudo' (verse 12), and the voice of controversy was no longer heard."]

The Apostles and elders of Jerusalem proceeded at once to draw up an Encyclical Letter, in accordance with the Apostolic Decrees (Acts xv. 23—29); and two portions of this demand our attention. Firstly, the hearty warmth of brotherly love with which they refer to SS. Paul and Barnabas (verses 25, 26); and secondly, the matter-of-course way in which they assume, as divinely given them, a spiritual jurisdiction over S. Paul's converts. "Visum est *Spiritui Sancto et nobis* nihil ultra *imponere vobis* oneris quàm hæc necessaria" (verse 28). And so far were SS. Paul and Barnabas from protesting against this in any kind of way, that on the contrary (verses 31—33) they and the whole Antiochene Church greeted the letter with extreme delight. And they received moreover its bearers with so hearty a welcome, that one of them, Silas, fixed his abode at Antioch.

V.

We are next to consider certain expressions, in S. Paul's own account (Gal. ii.) of what took place at Jerusalem, which Protestants have understood as implying some disparagement of his co-Apostles. Certainly, before we look into details at all, it is evident that these critics have embarked in a somewhat hopeless undertaking; because S. Paul begins by expressly saying, that he communicated with the Three, "ne fortè in vacuum currerem aut cucurrissem" (Gal. ii. 2). It is impossible to under-

stand S. Paul otherwise in these words, than as recognizing some singular authority vested in the Three or in one of their number. Dr. Lightfoot suggests (ad locum) that "these words must be taken to express his fear lest the Judaic Christians, by insisting on the Mosaic ritual, might thwart his past and present endeavours to establish a Church on a liberal basis." But on the Protestant view how could such a danger possibly exist? Nothing certainly would *in itself* be more repulsive to the Gentile converts, than the Jewish Ceremonial Law; and S. Paul himself was most clear and express in his warnings against their observing it. Dr. Lightfoot's suggestion then necessarily implies, what all Catholics believe to have been the case; viz., that S. Paul had imbued his converts with the deepest reverence for S. Peter's office. If such were indeed the fact, there was of course great danger lest the Judaizers—claiming as they did falsely S. Peter's authority (Acts xv. 24)—might succeed in perverting true doctrine among the Antiochenes. For ourselves however, we are inclined to understand verse 2 in a somewhat different sense; and would paraphrase it thus: "Lest if a suspicion once gained ground that my doctrine differed from that of my co-Apostles, my past and future labours might become fruitless." But whichever way you take the verse, it necessarily implies (as we have said) some very singular authority possessed by the Three or by one of their number. And is it *probable*, we ask,—this being so,—that S. Paul, in writing to the Galatian Church, should have proceeded to *increase*

the existing suspicion of a divergence between his doctrine and theirs, by referring to them in language of disparagement? The supposition is absurd. Moreover we may remind our readers, that in the first chapter he had already spoken most respectfully of S. Peter; and had explained that his chief reason for going at once to Jerusalem when driven from Damascus, was in order that he might make acquaintance with that Apostle. We proceed then to the particular phrases on which Protestants insist.

Several of them lay stress on "τοῖς δοκοῦσιν" in verse 2; "τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι" in verse 6; as though this phrase signified "those who seem to be, and claim to be, more than they are." But that this phrase implies no disparagement, is manifest; were it only for this circumstance, that it is substantially repeated in verse 9, where his direct purpose is to *magnify* the importance of "James and Cephas and John." And Catholic writers have shown that there are various passages of Scripture, where the Greek word, so translated, is used in a sense most suitable to the present context. The phrase, "those who seem to be something," undoubtedly means "those who are justly in repute"; "those who are, on good grounds, highly thought of": not "those who seem what they are not," but "who seem what they are." So Luke xxii. 24, which is translated in the Protestant version, "There arose a strife among them which should be greatest," runs in the original, "which of them *seems* to be greatest." Again, Mark x. 42:—"Those who

are accounted to rule over them" is really "those who *seem* to rule over them"; that is, "those who bear *visible* rule." And so Dr. Lightfoot translates the phrase (ad verse 2): "men of repute and honour." He adds that "the expression conveys no shadow of depreciation."

Next, verse 6. "Ab iis autem qui videbantur esse aliquid (quales aliquando fuerint nihil meâ interest: Deus personam hominis non accipit), mihi autem qui videbantur esse aliquid nihil contulerunt." Protestants commonly drop the word "aliquando" of the Vulgate rendering, and understand the verse in some such sense as the following: "I care not what they "or any other men think. God regards not the person "of men. These personages, with all their high claims, "could give *me* no light on Gospel Truth. I have my "own commission independent of them." As a mere matter of scholarship, never was there an interpretation more unfounded. The question turns entirely on the verb "προσανέθεντο." Hear Dr. Lightfoot on this word. "Προσανατίθεσθαι is 'to communicate, to impart,' whether for the purpose of giving or of obtaining instruction. In this passage the former meaning prevails, in i. 16 the latter. The context here decides its sense: 'they imparted no fresh knowledge to me; they saw nothing defective or incorrect in my teaching; but on the contrary, they heartily recognized my mission'" (p. 104). Such an expression then implies at once, that he recognized in the Three, or in one of them, a full right to inquire into his doctrine; and that he reports with emphasis and with pleasure the

favourable judgment passed on that doctrine. This sense of the word "contulerunt" being granted, it is absolutely impossible to give the verse a Protestant sense. Yet it may be well to consider what is in fact its precise meaning. For instance, what is to be understood by "ὁποῖοί ποτε ἦσαν, &c."? Most Protestant commentators have hitherto rejected the Vulgate word "aliquando," and have taken "ὁποῖοί ποτε" to mean "qualescunque": but Dr. Lightfoot (ad loc.) points out that "ποτε never occurs with the meaning 'cunque' in the New Testament." It is obvious to suppose, that his Judaizing enemies had represented him to the Galatians as despising the older Apostles, for being rude and unlearned Jews; for being unable to take enlarged and spiritual views of the Gospel. "It is nothing to me," he here says, "what was their origin or what their education. God is in no way dependent on such things; and may raise rude and illiterate fishermen, as easily as he can raise a Jewish doctor, into the position of an Apostle." This is in substance the second exposition given by Estius ad locum.

There are no other particular phrases cited by Protestants for their purpose; but they appeal further, and with great confidence, to the general rhetoric and bearing of the two chapters. We are most fully persuaded, on the contrary, that this general drift and bearing favours emphatically, not the Protestant, but the Catholic interpretation. But before embarking on this larger subject, it is necessary to notice another event, recorded in the same chapter,

which occurred very soon after the Council of Jerusalem.

At that period S. Peter went to reside at Antioch; and, indeed, as Tradition informs us, he established there for a time the Primatial See. It is in itself worthy of remark, that he thus established himself in the very metropolis (as one may say) of Gentile Christianity; and in that place which, of all others, would bring him into closest contact with S. Paul. Further, on his arrival, "he had no scruple about living as a Gentile; i.e., associating at table and in domestic life with Gentiles": and by so doing he became "in the eyes of all Jews a complete breaker of the Law" (Döllinger, p. 89; Gal. ii. 12). This is the first instance recorded in Scripture, where any Apostle thus acted; and the narrative further implies, that SS. Paul and Barnabas pursued a similar habit. It is no improbable conjecture, that this had been determined at Jerusalem by the Apostles in consultation with the elders, as the appropriate course for an Apostle to pursue while sojourning in Gentile Churches. After some time however, a number of the Hebrew Christians arrived at Antioch; and their arrival placed S. Peter in a great difficulty. "Fearing those who were of the Circumcision" (ver. 12) does not of course mean that he feared anything they could do against him—that he feared their ill opinion or the like—rather he feared *for* them. Thus (iv. 11), S. Paul says, "*I fear you*, lest I should have laboured in vain among you." And so S. Peter *feared* these Jews, lest if the full truth were prematurely forced upon their

notice—the truth that in fact there was no obligation on *any one* to keep the Mosaic ritual—they might seek relief from their perplexity in apostasy. He judged it better accordingly, during their sojourn, to fall back on the old recognized Apostolic practice of observing the Law. The fact that S. Paul's remonstrance against this has been woven into the texture of an inspired Epistle, gives ground for absolute certainty, that S. Peter here made a mistake of judgment. Still nothing could be more natural than that he should so act; and further, that the other Christians of the Circumcision, including S. Barnabas, should be led by him into practising the same course. It was but doing as they had always hitherto done.

Yet it was only to be expected, that S. Paul should see the whole matter in a most opposite light. Just as S. Peter by his history was led specially to realize the possible perplexity of the *Jewish* Christians, so S. Paul was no less led thereby to consider the very serious evil probably accruing in regard to the *Gentiles*. His argument, as we imagine, was of the following kind: —"Things cannot again be as they formerly were. To take a step backward, can never possibly be the same thing with not having taken a step forward. So long as the Apostles in any place observed the consistent practice of Jewish ceremonies, the case was different. But to continue for a considerable period eating with the Gentiles, and then cease to do so, is in fact to put an actual pressure on the Gentiles in a wrong direction. Such a procedure must act on them as a direct inducement to give up their Christian liberty, and to

take on themselves that yoke which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear." That the word "compel," in ver. 14, means no more than this *moral* pressure, or strong inducement, is admitted by Protestant commentators no less than by Catholic; and is indeed perfectly certain from the whole context. And S. Paul sees that his co-Apostles, by their procedure, "οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου" (verse 14): i.e. "are far from taking those steps, which are conducive to the advancement of Gospel Truth."

We are now therefore to consider, how these facts bear on the two main points of our inquiry. Firstly, do they show that S. Peter was less thoroughly acquainted with Gospel Truth than S. Paul? No one can possibly think so. The very protest, made by the latter, regarded S. Peter's "dissimulation": i.e., his not publicly professing what he interiorly held. Such "dissimulation" had been hitherto the universal habit of the Apostles. Nay, it was practised by S. Paul himself again and again; after this period no less than before it. He practised it, when he circumcised Timothy "because of the Jews, who were in those parts" (Acts xvi. 3); when he shaved his head in Cenchrea (Acts xviii. 18); when he purified himself in the Temple at Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 26). But he considered the present a very ill-chosen occasion for such "dissimulation." There was no difference then whatever, nor any tendency to difference, between S. Peter and himself, on any doctrinal point: their difference turned exclusively on a matter of spiritual prudence.

Secondly then we are to ask, whether S. Paul implied

any denial of S. Peter's Primacy. And to ask such a question is to answer it. No Catholic in the world ever dreamed of maintaining, that the Supreme Pontiff is exempt from all liability to pursue an unwise and imprudent course; nay, or that earnest remonstrance may not be lawfully and meritoriously addressed to him by any grave and confidential adviser, who considers that he is entering on such a course. Suppose indeed the impossible case, that S. Peter had commanded S. Paul to separate from the Gentiles, and that S. Paul had disobeyed,—Catholic theology, no doubt, would be shaken to its foundations; but there is not the most distant suggestion of the kind. And Protestants strangely misapprehend a Catholic's view of the relation between the two Apostles, if they imagine that he would see anything in S. Paul's demeanour which was not most edifying and Christian.

If Protestants most gratuitously assume that S. Peter, after S. Paul's remonstrance, pursued an unchanged course, Catholics have just as much right to assume the reverse. The latter conclusion is certainly much the more probable of the two. For, as will be immediately seen, S. Paul's main purpose in these two chapters is to vindicate himself against all suspicion of doctrinal divergence from the earlier Apostles; and it is most improbable therefore that he would have referred the Galatians to any incident, which implied a permanent divergence of practical conduct and spiritual policy between S. Peter and himself. For ourselves—as a matter of personal impression—we cannot doubt that S. Peter promptly recognized and

repaired his mistake; and at all events we never heard of anything alleged either from Scripture or Tradition, which tends to negative such an impression.

This whole history then, as we have seen, involves no disparagement of S. Peter's Primacy. But in fact there are one or two particulars in it, which somewhat *corroborate* that doctrine. For instance, "I withstood him to the face" (verse 11). The very form of expression implies a certain boldness of act. To differ ever so strongly from one whom he regarded as in all respects his equal, would hardly have been expressed by so strong and forcible a phrase. Then again, even S. Barnabas—between whom and S. Paul no shadow of difference had yet arisen,—who had just received *with* S. Paul a commission to the Gentiles,—even S. Barnabas followed S. Peter rather than S. Paul. For what imaginable reason, except the former's superior authority? And how very strong a word is "ἀναγκάζεις" in verse 14! How very great an influence does it ascribe to S. Peter, over S. Paul's own Gentile converts!

But, as we just now observed, there is an argument derived from the general rhetoric and bearing of the two chapters, which Protestants consider of irresistible force. "Surely it is most plain on the surface," they argue, "that S. Paul's very object throughout is the "claiming to himself an authority supreme and ab-"solute in its own order; an authority, derived from "God by direct commission, and independent therefore "of the earlier Apostles. Even granting, for argu-"ment's sake, that S. Paul's resistance to S. Peter at

"Antioch may be sufficiently explained;—yet why "should S. Paul recount all this so very emphatically, "at a later period, to the Galatians? Or why does "he dwell so earnestly (i. 16, 17) on the fact that, "immediately after his conversion, his 'communication "was not with flesh and blood'; and that for three "years he had no intercourse with the earlier Apostles? "Why does he regard this fact as so important (verse "20), that he even attests it with an oath? Why, "lastly, does he assure us so earnestly and so pointedly "(ii. 3—5) that he withheld all concession to the 'false "brethren,' and refused to allow S. Titus's circum-"cision? What motive can possibly be assigned for "all this, unless a motive which is fatal to Catholic "doctrine; viz., the vindicating as his just due a "personal and independent authority?"

We reply most confidently, in the very teeth of the objection, (1) that the general rhetoric and bearing of the two chapters are easily intelligible on a Catholic hypothesis; but that (2) they are utterly irreconcilable with any Protestant view. All that is necessary for their full and clear understanding, is to make one hypothesis: and this moreover an hypothesis, which every one must acknowledge to be in itself most simple and probable, nay obviously suggested by the facts of the case.

It is perfectly certain, and admitted by Catholics and Protestants alike, that S. Paul's steps were dogged at every turn by active and vehement opposers of his teaching. It is equally certain, that these Judaizing opposers claimed the authority of S. Peter

and the earlier Apostles as on their side, and charged S. Paul with the introduction of mischievous and dangerous novelties. The hypothesis which we make grows at once out of this admitted fact. That in a certain sense S. Paul possessed the sanction of S. Peter and the rest, was surely too manifest and notorious to admit of dispute. We suppose therefore, that these Judaizers, when pressed, confessed so much, but gave their own account of the fact. They maintained that S. Paul was double-faced; and that he preached a most different doctrine when in communication with the earlier Apostles, from that which he inculcated on his Gentile converts. And there were circumstances in S. Paul's life undoubtedly, on which such an accusation might be plausibly founded. Such was his circumcising S. Timothy (Acts xvi. 3), "because of the Jews who were in those parts." Such also was the fact recorded in Acts xxi. 26. In both these cases, as in many others, S. Paul, being a Jew, practised the Jewish Law, expressly for the purpose of avoiding all offence to the Jews. To this general habit he himself alludes (1 Cor. ix. 19—21, also x. 32, 33). We are not here explaining how S. Paul's conduct in all this was perfectly reasonable and consistent; though this might easily be done. We are but citing it in corroboration of our hypothesis. And let this hypothesis be once conceded, the two chapters thence acquire a most natural and intelligible drift. We may paraphrase them as follows:—

"These, my opponents, declare to you that they "have learned their views of Christianity from S. Peter

" and the elder Apostles. I totally deny it: and I
" have, in fact, far more means than they have for
" knowing the mind of those Apostles. Yet you must
" not understand the case to be, that you have only
" to balance *their* interpretation of Peter's meaning
" against *my* interpretation. My Gospel is indeed
" the very same as Peter's: but it was not from Peter
" that I learned it. It was not from flesh and blood,
" that I received my instruction in Christian Truth.
" He who so mercifully Himself converted me, Him-
" self also taught me. I call God to witness, that
" it was three years after my conversion before I
" even saw Peter: even then I saw no other Apostle
" except James; and was for some time longer un-
" known by face to the Jewish Christians altogether.
" It was not from them that I ever professed to learn
" the Gospel.

" However, when I found reports to be so sedu-
" lously spread as to my differences from Peter, I
" was warned by God to go up to Jerusalem, in order
" to confer with him and with the other chief pillars
" of the Church. I fully knew indeed, that the most
" perfect harmony of doctrine would be discovered
" between us; and so the event showed. They had
" nothing to add to the Gospel which I preached;
" and I received from them a distinct commission to
" occupy, as my peculiar province, the preaching to
" the Gentiles. It is with their express and direct
" sanction, that I have preached to you the Gospel.
" It has been said against me that, in my communica-
" tions with them, I habitually conceal the most cha-

"racteristic parts of my teaching. The most obvious "facts are sufficient to refute this. At my first visit "to Jerusalem, I had seen no Apostle except Peter "and James, and remained there only fifteen days: "so that there was but little opportunity for such "hypocrisy. But in this other visit, which took "place fourteen years after, a circumstance took "place which shows how very openly I spoke. For "I peremptorily refused, though strongly urged, to "allow Titus's circumcision. I refused this, in order "that I might avoid even the external semblance of "concession to those who would destroy Gospel "liberty. Nay, shortly afterwards I went further "still. I remonstrated publicly with the very Prince "of the Apostles, when the necessity seemed to arise; "when he showed himself wanting in clear percep-"tion as to that line of conduct which was called "for, at a particular crisis, by the principles which "we hold in common. If my teaching then possesses "his full sanction, as my very opponents hardly "deny, that sanction most certainly cannot have "arisen from any concealment practised by me in his "regard."

Interpreted then by Catholic doctrine, these chapters are most intelligible and most persuasive. But how can Protestants consistently explain them? They can understand doubtless, in accordance with their own notions, the particular passage, Gal. ii. 11—14; but how can they even attempt to set forth the connection of the whole? How will they explain "ἱστορῆσαι Κήφαν"? or the stress which S. Paul lays (ii. 9) on

the sanction he had received from the Three? above all, what imaginable rendering will they suggest for those very striking words (ii. 2) "ne fortè in vacuum currerem aut cucurrissem"? We only wish some Protestant would apply himself to doing what *we* have done; to drawing out a general paraphrase of the two chapters. In no other way would men so plainly see the hopeless failure of any attempt at a Protestant interpretation.

VI.

We have now gone through, we believe, all those portions of Scripture, on which Protestants rely; and we have done enough therefore for strictly controversial purposes. Yet there are several other very interesting Scriptural questions, closely connected with the same subject, which we wish we had room to consider. We are referring, e.g., to S. Paul's agreement with S. Peter in his profound reverence for the Old Testament, and in the precedence which he invariably ascribes to the Jews; to the deep identity in doctrine between S. Paul's inspired Epistles on the one hand, and those of the Three on the other hand;* to the many subtle indications, throughout S. Paul's Epistles, of his affectionate reverence for S. Peter.

* Dr. Lightfoot (pp. 342, 343) gives really strong ground, we think, for considering, that even S. James's language about "faith" and "works" was not directed against any perversion of S. Paul's teaching.

Indeed, we believe that the more accurate and critical study of Scripture, which is so characteristic of these times, has led thoughtful Protestant scholars to a far truer appreciation of the harmony between these two Apostles, than formerly prevailed among their co-religionists.

And Tradition declares on its surface what Scripture discloses to the careful inquirer. It universally represents SS. Peter and Paul, not as rivals, but on the contrary as bound together in strictest amity; as jointly enriching the Roman Church with their doctrine, and glorifying her by their martyrdom. "Glorious princes of the earth," sings the Church, "as they loved each other in their life, so also in their death they were not divided." Nor has she any more touching practice, than that of never celebrating the name of either, without also commemorating the other.

S. MARY MAGDALENE IN THE GOSPELS.

A Homely Discourse. Mary Magdalene. London: Washbourne.

Articles "Lazarus" and "Mary Magdalene" in "Smith's Dictionary of the Bible." By Professor PLUMPTRE.

Commentary on the Gospel of S. John. By E. W. HENGSTENBERG, D.D. Translated from the German. Dissertation on John xi. 1. Edinburgh: Clark.

[July 1872.]

CATHOLICS of the present day commonly take for granted, that S. Mary Magdalene was the sister of Martha, and identical also with the "peccatrix" of Luke vii. 37. The author e. g. of the pleasing discourse, which we name at the head of our article, has evidently never dreamed of doubting the fact; and indeed the Church's whole office for July 22nd is based throughout on the assumption. On the other hand, those who are more prominent among Protestants at this moment for the pious spirit, the diligence, the accuracy, with which they study Scripture, are more and more tending to unanimity in the opinion, that Mary Magdalene, Mary of Bethany, and the peccatrix were three distinct and separate persons. Nor will it be doubted by any one who candidly examines the arguments adduced for this conclusion, that they carry with them at the first blush much appearance of force. The question—not to mention its import-

ance in other respects—is so interesting in a devotional and ascetical point of view, as to be well worthy of consideration.

Our readers will naturally inquire in the first instance, whether, apart from the statements of Scripture itself, there is any historical proof of the received Catholic view: but we are not aware of any Catholic, who even alleges the existence of any such proof. There is a second preliminary question, however, to which the answer is not so simple. It may be asked whether the concurrent judgment of so many holy men in every age, and the sanction more or less explicitly given by the Church to that judgment, should not by itself suffice to secure the assent of loyal Catholics. On this second question we shall say a few words at the close of our article; but our main purpose is to pursue the inquiry on the exclusive ground of Scripture. Even this limited task we are as far as possible from professing to perform exhaustively: on the contrary we shall but suggest two or three hints, in the hope that more competent critics may carry them out, or modify and correct them, as the case may be. We will at once express our own opinion, that the text of Scripture, considered by itself and in its own light, establishes, not indeed a certainty, but an enormous preponderance of probability, in favour of the received Catholic view.

I.

It will be more convenient to our readers, if we indicate at starting the chief relevant passages of Scripture. We begin them with the peccatrix of S. Luke.

"But a certain one of the Pharisees [named Simon] asked Him to eat with him; and entering into the Pharisee's house he reclined [at table]. And behold a woman, who was a sinner in the city, hearing that He reclined [at table] in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster box of ointment, and stood weeping behind at His feet, and began to moisten His feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hair of her head, and kissed His feet and anointed them with ointment, &c." (Luke vii. 36—38.)

Immediately after this narrative S. Luke thus proceeds:—

"And it came to pass thereafter that He travelled through the cities and villages, preaching and evangelizing the Kingdom of God; and with Him the twelve; and [also] certain women who had been healed from evil spirits and from infirmities, Mary called Magdalene from whom seven devils had gone out, and Joanna, &c." (Luke viii. 1, 2.)

At a later period of S. Luke's Gospel we hear:—

"But it came to pass as they went that He entered a certain village; and a certain woman, Martha by name, received Him into her house. And she had a sister named Mary, who sat also at the Lord's feet, and hearkened to His word, &c." (x. 38–9.)

We now come to S. John :—

"But there was a certain sick man, Lazarus, of Bethany, from the village of Mary and her sister Martha. It was Mary who anointed the Lord with ointment and wiped His feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was sick, &c." (xi. 1, 2.)

Then, after Lazarus's resuscitation,—

"They prepared for Him there a supper, and Martha ministered.....Mary therefore took a pound of precious ointment, and anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped His feet with her hair; and the house was filled with the odour of the ointment, &c." (xii. 2, 3.)

We do not insert the parallel passages to this last from S. Matthew and S. Mark; because it cannot be denied, without manifest eccentricity, that they *are* parallel and describe the same event. We further assume, as a position which cannot be denied without manifest eccentricity, that the Mary and Martha of Luke x. are identical with the Mary and Martha of S. John.

From these and other notices of Scripture we think that the two following conclusions, which are Maldodonatus's, may be inferred, with the highest degree of probability which is short of absolute certainty. Firstly the anointing of Luke vii. is an entirely distinct act from that of John xii.; but secondly, the agent on both occasions was the same, being no other than S. Mary Magdalene. The latter of these conclusions has long been almost universal among Catholics. The former is advocated by various distinguished Catholic writers besides Maldonatus.

He himself cites in its favour S. Ambrose, S. Augustine, and S. Bede. We can appeal on its behalf to the authority, singularly high on such a subject, of F. Coleridge. (See "Vita Vitæ," p. 67.) F. Newman, in his fourth Discourse to Mixed Congregations, takes it for granted. F. Dalgairns, in a passage which we shall quote before we conclude, implies the same opinion. Professor Plumptre (if we rightly understand him) ascribes it also to the Bollandist writer on July 22nd.

In behalf of this our first conclusion, we need say very little. We are throughout mainly contending against Protestants: and on this particular point we are in accordance with their almost unanimous opinion; though one of them, Hengstenberg, whom we name at the head of our article, warmly dissents. We refer our readers then to the reasoning of Maldonatus (in Matt. xxvi. 6 and John xi. 2), and only add three remarks of our own. (1) The testimony of S. John (xi. 2) seems to us almost decisive on the matter, as we shall presently point out in a different connection. (2) To our mind, every attempt at harmonizing Luke vii. with John xii. does but place in clearer light the utter hopelessness of such a task; and we were never before so firmly convinced that the two scenes are distinct, as when we read Hengstenberg's laborious effort to prove them identical. (3) There is a distinction between the two anointings, which should by no means escape notice. In S. Luke the peccatrix moistens His feet with her *tears*: a circumstance most natural in the first transports of conversion,

but which very significantly is absent from all three accounts of the anointing at Bethany. It may further be added that, as appears from S. Matthew and S. Mark, at Bethany Mary anointed, not His feet only but also His head. This is hardly reconcilable with the wording of Luke vii.; while at the same time, as Mr. Isaac Williams points out,* the change of action is most touchingly significative of her changed situation at the later period, and of her increased confidence in her Saviour's love. Indeed if we look at the two narratives with all their attendant circumstances, we may say that the earlier act is the more excited, the later the more solemn and (as one may say) more *ritual*.

II.

The main stress however of our argument must evidently turn on the *second* of our two conclusions. In behalf of this conclusion, we shall lay down three successive theses. And our first shall be, that—putting aside all the texts which mention Magdalene—Mary of Bethany is pointed out in Scripture as identical with the peccatrix of Luke vii. Protestant commentators in general are especially earnest against this particular thesis. "Many persons" says Mr. Williams, "would be inclined to allow that Magdalene may be Mary sister of Martha; and many would be disposed to take for granted that Magdalene was 'the

* "On the Passion," p. 412.

sinner.' But most persons would be very loath to suppose that the good sister of Martha should be 'the sinner.'"* "There is not the slightest trace" says Professor Plumptre (p. 257) "of the life of Mary of Bethany ever having been one of open and flagrant impurity." Such a supposition, Protestants often add, is considered additionally improbable, from the *position* held by her family. "All the circumstances of John xi. and xii.—the feast for so many guests, the number of friends who came from Jerusalem, the alabaster box, the ointment of spikenard very costly, the funeral vault of their own, point to wealth and social position above the average." (Plumptre, p. 78.) Then again, as Protestants are especially fond of insisting, if this identity be supposed, "Mary, whom we have been accustomed to regard as a silent soul involved in meditation, who has opened her pure heart to the Redeemer as the tender flowers silently unfold themselves to the sun, becomes a wild and tameless woman, who first found in Christ stillness for her passions, and convulsively clings to Him still, lest the calmness of the waters of her soul should be exchanged again for tempest."†

We reserve to a later part of the article our inquiry, whether the character of Mary, Martha's sister, is different from what we might expect to find in the converted peccatrix: here we content ourselves with

* We should explain that Mr. Williams himself *does* incline to accept this view.

† This is Hengstenberg's account (p. 3) of an objection very common among Protestants, which he is to answer.

expressing our dissent from any such notion. As to the rest, we readily admit that a certain presumption arises against us, from the circumstances recounted in the objection. Still this presumption should go for very little, considering that S. John really seems to testify our thesis almost in so many words. "It was Mary" he says (xi. 2) "who had anointed the Lord with oil, ... whose brother Lazarus was sick." As Maldonatus urges,—the Greek word is in the aorist after an imperfect, and in its one obvious meaning refers to some act *which had already taken place.* "Ἦν δὲ Μαρία ἡ ἀλείψασα," &c., &c. No one, we think, unless he were defending a theory, would look this text deliberately in the face,* and maintain that it can be understood, without grave distortion, as referring to a future act. On the other hand be it remembered, that S. John wrote for the very purpose of supplementing the earlier Evangelists; and especially of supplementing S. Luke. It was pointed out in our number for October 1864 (p. 427) by a writer, whom we may now without impropriety mention to have been F. Coleridge, that "almost the whole of S. John might be inserted in large sections between various breaks in the third Gospel, and a continuous history be thus made up of the two." There really then, we think, cannot be a fair doubt, that S. John in this

* We mean to imply by this language, that the many Catholic writers, who identify the anointing of Luke vii. with that of Bethany, have not for the most part duly pondered this verse in the Greek, and deliberately given it an anticipatory sense. From the *Latin* alone, the argument is far less strong.

verse distinctly declares the identity of Lazarus's sister with her, of whom S. Luke had narrated that she anointed the Lord with ointment and wiped His feet with her hair.*

There can be no fair doubt, we think, of this interpretation: still, since some *have* doubted it, we will add a corroboration, which on other grounds also is of some importance. It is evident that S. John was thinking of S. Luke in this part of his Gospel, because he refers to him in the preceding verse. "Lazarus was of Bethany, from the village of Mary and Martha"; i.e. he was an *inhabitant* of Bethany, but came *originally* from a certain other village. Greswell insists with much force on this distinction between "ἀπὸ" and "ἐκ" (Dissertations, vol. ii. p. 482); and is supported, not only by Professor Plumptre (p. 78, note), but also (as that writer mentions) by the illustrious scholar Hermann. Thus our Blessed Lord is always said to be "ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲτ," and never once "ἐκ." And as Professor Plumptre justly observes, even though by degrees both words might come to be used *apart* with hardly any shade of difference, their use *in close juxtaposition* might still be antithetical: nay, we would even say, *must* be antithetical in the verse before us, because otherwise the change of prepositions in the same sentence would be senseless. Even apart from this particular linguistic question, there are strong

* It is a small matter, but worthy of mention, that all three of the Evangelists state the ointment used at *Bethany* to have been "very precious." In Luke vii. there is no mention of this; *neither is there in John* xi. 2.

grounds for our statement. It is surely a forced hypothesis, that a place so important in Scripture as Bethany, and so frequently named, should be called by the title of "Mary and Martha's village." Still more unaccountable is it, that Bethany should be called "the village of Mary and Martha," rather than "of Lazarus" whom S. John is directly mentioning. Hardly less strange would it be if S. Luke, who so often mentions Bethany by name, had in one place (x. 38) called it vaguely "a certain village." On the other hand, S. John's expression would be most natural, if he intended reference to a Galilean unnamed "village," mentioned by S. Luke as containing Martha's house and as the scene of our Lord's temporary abode with her and Mary.* In both verses then, S. John is connecting his narrative with S. Luke; and as verse 1 refers to Luke x., so (returning to our immediate purpose) verse 2 refers to Luke vii. In his first verse he identifies his own Mary of Bethany with S. Luke's Mary, sister of Martha; and in his second he identifies her with S. Luke's peccatrix.

At last however, we would not account the inference which we derive from John vi. 2, as absolutely final

* The only explanation we can find suggested on the other view is, that S. John called Bethany "the village of Mary and Martha," in order to distinguish it from the other Bethany which was beyond Jordan. But the expression would *not* so distinguish it; because he had said nothing whatever previously, as to *which* was the Bethany where Mary and Martha dwelt. If it be said that his readers knew this fact *aliunde*, it is certain that they must have equally known aliunde where *Lazarus* dwelt; and consequently the verse could give no one any information whatever.

and peremptory; in such sense that no imaginable amount of reasoning on the other side could justify a different view. We do not maintain this, because we would not deny that there may be some few Scriptural texts, of which the true sense is a very unobvious one. But our whole argument here is concerned with *probabilities*. And we say it is indefinitely more improbable that S. John's words refer to an event which had not yet happened,—than that Mary's history should have been very exceptional in its character, and that the Evangelists should be silent on certain previous events of her life.

A further argument may possibly be adduced against our thesis, though we are not aware that any Protestant has so adduced it. "Many of the Jews," says S. John (xi. 19), "had come to Martha and Mary to console them for their brother." On this Professor Plumptre remarks very reasonably (p. 78), that "the particular sense which attaches to *S. John's* use of the phrase 'the Jews,'—as equivalent to Scribes, Elders, and Pharisees,—suggests the inference that these visitors or friends belonged to that class." It may be objected then that—considering the well-known character of Pharisaism—such a circumstance disproves the supposition of Mary having been so recently an abandoned sinner. The reply however is obvious. If Mary were the peccatrix, she was living in Galilee at the time of her conversion. Her earlier course is not one of those facts which families love to blazon about; and it must not be supposed that private gossip would then circulate from Galilee to Jerusalem,

as it might now from Scotland to London. However certain it were then that Mary is the peccatrix, we see no fragment of reason for supposing that the Scribes and Pharisees, who came to know her in Bethany, were cognizant of the fact.

We ground our thesis then mainly on the circumstance that, unless we suppose the ordinary use of language revolutionized, John xi. 2 refers to a past fact; and that no such fact is dreamed of by any one, except that recorded in Luke vii. But secondly, even could it be admitted that the verse is anticipatory in its sense,—even on this supposition, our thesis would still hold its ground. On such an hypothesis, S. John intended to declare: "this Mary was the woman, so well known throughout the Church as having anointed the Lord and wiped His feet with her hair."* But he would not thus have spoken, if there had been *two* women famous for this fact. The form of speech implies, that this one particular devotional act was characteristic of this one particular disciple. Maldonatus urges this, on Matt. xxvi. 6.

And this brings us to another corroborative argument. It was a common enough practice to honour some distinguished guest by anointing his head (see e. g. Luke vii. 46); but that a woman should anoint the *feet* and wipe them with her hair—this is a very special and peculiar act of devotion, and one not likely to enter the mind of two different persons. As

* So paraphrases Godet, one of our ablest opponents: "Cette Marie dont je parle ici est la femme qui est connue comme ayant oint, &c." (On John xi. 2.)

Mr. Isaac Williams observes (p. 412), "it was an action that could not have been done by a second person from imitation, and would scarce have spontaneously occurred to two different persons. But when we consider both the anointings to have been by one and the same individual," there is an exquisite propriety about their variety of attendant circumstances, on which we have already remarked.

III.

Our first thesis then has been, that—putting aside altogether the texts which mention Magdalene—Mary of Bethany is pointed out in Scripture as identical with the peccatrix. Our second shall be, that—putting aside altogether the texts which mention Mary of Bethany—the peccatrix is pointed out in Scripture as identical with Magdalene. We will commence our argument for this thesis, by pointing out the position expressly allotted to Magdalene in the Gospels.

Immediately after the scene of the peccatrix described in Luke vii.—with no interval whatever, even the slightest—occurs the first distinct mention of Magdalene. There appears on the scene a personage, new in name,—of whose antecedents nothing whatever is recorded in any part of Scripture, except the statement, twice repeated, that out of her seven devils had gone forth,*—but who assumes in some respects the most prominent place of all the disciples. Whether

* Luke viii. 2; Mark xvi. 9.

as regards grace, we say, or whether as regards privilege, Magdalene is in more than one important particular placed higher, than any other whosoever of our Lord's followers. In saying this, we do not of course include His Holy Mother, who belongs (as we may say) to a different sphere from all other human persons; but we do include all the Apostles. Look e. g. at the most eventful and critical part of Gospel history. All the Apostles forsook our Lord and fled, though S. John soon took heart again. The body of holy women stood afar off, gazing from a distance on the Crucified (Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40, 41). But Magdalene and one other kept company with His Mother at the Cross's very foot, exposed to all the insults and outrages of His raging enemies. With that other holy woman she remained publicly sitting before the sepulchre, when their companions had withdrawn (Matt. xxvii. 61); and visited it again next day (xxviii. 1). She was the first, if not the only one, of the holy women, who summoned Peter and John to the sepulchre (John xxi. 2). She was the first to see our Lord when risen; and this fact was accounted of so much importance, that (over and above S. John's detailed description) S. Mark calls special attention to it.* She not only saw Him, but was favoured with a solitary and somewhat lengthened interview. It was

* Mark xvi. 9, "apparuit *primò* Mariæ Magdalenæ." In our number for April 1867 [see pp. 212, 213 of this volume], we have urged, that this statement implies no denial of the indubitable fact, that His Mother saw Him risen before any other human being saw Him.

she who first "went and told it to them who had been with Him, as they mourned and wept." (S. Mark xvi. 10.) Hengstenberg truly adds (pp. 18, 19) that "as Peter regularly stands at the head in the list of the Apostles, so does Magdalene when women are mentioned. The place of honour is given her in all the four Evangelists. Thus it is in the enumeration of the women who followed Jesus in Galilee, Luke viii. 2; in the narrative of the Crucifixion, Matt. xxvii. 56, Mark xv. 40, 47; of the Entombment, Matt. xxvii. 61, Mark xv. 47; of the Resurrection, Matt. xxviii. 1, Mark xvi. 1, Luke xxiv. 10. The only exception is John xix. 25, where the other Mary is mentioned before Magdalene. But this was evidently done, to avoid sundering the former from the Mother of Jesus previously mentioned;" and in no way therefore detracts from the significance of the fact, to which Hengstenberg draws attention.

The devout student of Scripture, when he observes these singular privileges, will as a matter of course look back for the early history of one thus singularly graced and honoured. To find merely that "seven spirits had gone out of her," is no satisfaction whatever of his holy curiosity. But if he does but look at the passage *immediately preceding* the first mention of Magdalene, he will find the very phenomenon of which he is in quest. As Magdalene exceeded all the other disciples whomsoever in certain important particulars of grace and privilege, so the peccatrix exceeded all the other recorded disciples whomsoever in the exercise of those virtues which are characteristically

Christian.* Jesus Christ came on earth, that He might draw sinners to repentance; and the special means on their part whereby He was to draw them, was to be their faith, hope, and love towards Himself. Now no other disciple is recorded as having equalled the peccatrix, in these virtues of repentance, faith, hope and charity. She was changed in a moment, from the lowest depth of moral abasement, to meriting the solemn declaration "thy sins are forgiven thee" (ver. 48). And by what means on her side was this conversion wrought? Our Lord tells her that it is her faith which has saved her (ver. 50); and declares also by most manifest implication (ver. 47), that the fervour of her present love is proportioned to the grievousness of her past offences.† When did any

* We prescind entirely of course, as before, from the most Holy Virgin. We prescind also from the case of the penitent thief; on which we speak presently in the text, and which rather confirms our argument than otherwise.

† Alford (in locum) admits it to be certain, that the Vulgate text "quæ erat in civitate peccatrix" is correct; and beyond all question the obvious sense of this is, in Alford's words, that "she was known in the place by public repute, as carrying on a sinful occupation in the city."

The following remarks of Archbishop Trench, in his admirable volume on our Lord's Parables, deserve to be quoted :—"That a woman, and one of a character such as is here represented, should have pressed into the guest-chamber,—and this uninvited either by the Lord or by the master of the house,—and that she should have there been permitted to offer to the Saviour the form of homage which she did, may at first sight appear strange; yet after all does not require the supposition of something untold for its explanation, as that she was a relation of Simon's, or lived in the same house,—suppositions which are altogether strange, not to say

Apostle—when did S. Peter or S. John—exhibit such external marks of love for Jesus, as were displayed in this most memorable scene? The whole circumstance is so beautifully set forth by F. Dalgairns, that we are sure our readers will thank us for the length of our quotation. We need hardly say we are not intending

contradictory, to the narrative. A little acquaintance with the manners of the East, where meals are so often almost public, where ranks are not separated with such iron barriers as with us, makes us feel with what ease such an occurrence might have taken place. Or if this seems not altogether to explain the circumstance, one has only to think how easily such obstacles as might have been raised up against her, and would have seemed insuperable to others, or to herself in another state of mind, would have been put aside or broken through by an earnestness such as now possessed her. Even as it is, the very nature of such religious earnestness is to break through and despise these barriers, nor ever to pause and ask itself whether according to the world's judgment it be 'in season' or 'out of season.'"

In a note he subjoins the following excellently chosen citations:—"Beautifully Augustine (Enarr. in Ps. cxl. 4): Illa impudica, quondam frontosa ad fornicationem, frontosior ad salutem, irrupit in domum alienam. And again (Serm. xcix. c. 1): Vidistis mulierem famosam . . . non invitatam irruisse convivio, ubi suus medicus recumbebat, et quæsisse piâ impudentiâ sanitatem: irruens quasi importuna convivio, opportuna beneficio. And Gregory (Hom. 33 in Evang.): Quia turpitudinis suæ maculas aspexit, lavanda ad fontem misericordiæ cucurrit, convivantes non erubuit: Nam quia semetipsam graviter erubescebat intus, nihil esse credidit, quod verecundaretur foris. And another (Bern. Opp., v. ii. p. 601): Gratias tibi, ô beatissima peccatrix; ostendisti mundo tutum satis peccatoribus locum, pedes scilicet Jesu, qui neminem spernunt, neminem rejiciunt, neminem repellunt: suscipiunt omnes, omnes admittunt. Ibi certè Æthiopissa mutat pellem suam; ibi pardus mutat varietatem suam; ibi solus Pharisæus non exspumat superbiam suam."

to *assume* here, that the peccatrix was Magdalene and Martha's sister.

"There is one wicked and notorious sinner who has come to hear Him, not out of a wish to be better, but because her sister Martha has talked her into it. She goes along the street in the pomp and insolence of her beauty, the jewels glittering in her hair, throwing shameless glances around her, with sin in every look and every gesture. She is going to hear the Nazarene preach, and to defy His power. She comes within His influence, her looks are bent upon Him, and the sweet sound of His words reaches her ear. Oh! what a change comes over her; her eyes are riveted upon Him, and her colour comes and goes. The tones of that voice have gone down to depths in her soul, of which she herself knew nothing. A moment ago she gloried in the triumph of her fascination, and exulted in her sinful power. Rich, noble, and young as she was, she could, especially in that ancient pagan world, set public opinion at defiance. Numbers as depraved as she had shared the counsels and the friendship of the world's heroes and statesmen. But all at once there rises up before her a new thought for her, the degradation of sin. And then, with a crushing force, comes the view of God's dread justice, of death, and of eternity. She would have sunk to the earth had there not mingled with it, in the very depth of her horror and astonishment, the gentle hope of the mercy of God. Scared and frightened by these unwonted tumults, she rushes back to her home. Who could be the preacher that so strangely moved her? Who was the man that knew her soul so well? At the very sound of His voice light had flashed upon her mind, her trembling will had owned some mighty sway, and her proud heart had been crushed within her. Who could it be but God? She had heard of old of 'God

with us,' of the mighty God who was to be born of a virgin, and, enlightened by divine grace, she felt that this must be He. She had seen her God, and yet, strange to say, guilty as she was, she felt no dismay; an unutterable love had taken possession of her soul, and she must see that heavenly countenance again. He could banish her for ever, and well He might, considering what she was; but she must look upon the face of her God once more, if it were for the last time. She knew that He was to be at a banquet; her presence would be felt as a leprosy by all, but she cared not. What was the world to her now? So she cast off her silken robes and put on her worst attire; and she took the jewels from her hair and trampled them under foot. With dishevelled locks flowing down her shoulders, and an alabaster vase of precious ointment in her hands, she walks rapidly through the streets to the house of the Pharisee. The guests stare wildly on her, as in this apparition, with pallid face and streaming hair, they recognize the Magdalene. But she sees no one but Jesus. All eyes are fixed on Him with greater wonder as she takes her station on her knees behind Him, as He lay reclining on the couch, according to the Roman custom. All think that He will shrink from her; but see, she grows bolder still, her lips approach His feet. Now surely He will rise and spurn her from Him. But, no, He bears the touch of her polluted lips, and the poor lost creature breaks her vase and pours her ointment on His feet, while her bursting tears flow unrebuked upon them, and her long hair wipes off the moisture. Well may the Pharisee say in his scornful heart, This is no prophet, or He would have spurned her from Him. It is no prophet, but the omniscient God, He who had created and 'called her by her name,' who had 'allured her and spoken to her heart.' And now He turns His eyes upon her, and, amidst the breathless

silence of the spectators, the gentle tones of His voice bid them look upon that 'woman,' and proclaim aloud that because she loves Him she is forgiven." ("Devotion to the Heart of Jesus," pp. 137–140.)

It is difficult, after such burning words, to resume our dry and methodical reasoning: but each man must serve God according to his gift, and the present writer has no eloquence at his command. Our argument then is this: On one side there stands a holy woman, whose earlier life is nowhere mentioned, but who is pre-eminent above all the other disciples in various most important particulars of grace and privilege. On the other side there stands a holy woman, whose *later* life is nowhere mentioned, but who is pre-eminent over all the other disciples in the exercise of characteristically Christian virtues. Moreover, the first mention of the former occurs *immediately* after the sole mention of the latter; attention being expressly drawn by S. Luke to the consecutiveness of time.* These two facts precisely fit into each other, like the wards of a key into its lock; and an extreme probability results, that the two holy women are identical.

A page or two back we said in a note, that in our remarks on the peccatrix we prescind from all reference to the penitent thief. Our reason was of course, because it may well be doubted, whether he did not exhibit in an *equal* degree the virtues of repentance, faith, hope and charity. And so the Church unites the two together: "Qui Mariam absolvisti, et latronem

* "Ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς, &c." (Luke viii. 1). "Ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς"="paullo post." (Schleusner.)

exaudîsti." We need hardly say that his case rather strengthens our argument than otherwise. If his Christian graces were publicly manifested, so also was the *reward* of those graces. He was straightway confirmed in grace; his future salvation publicly announced; and he has been made in every age of the Church the patron and model of death-bed conversion.

The objection, far more commonly than any other raised against our thesis by Protestants, is this: Magdalene had been possessed by *devils;* and our thesis understands this statement as expressing, that she had led a life of sin. But no one, say these Protestants, is described in Scripture as *possessed* by devils, who is freely yielding his will to their solicitation; but one only who is in such sense their slave, as to be irresponsible for the actions done under their influence. Now we are not aware that any Protestants have attempted to *prove* this allegation; and we are confident that if they did, they would find proof impossible. Nor, indeed, are Protestants quite unanimous on the matter. Thus Mr. Burgon, who is honourably distinguished for his singularly careful study of the Gospels, gives very strong testimony on our side. He is so far from maintaining confidently the identity of Magdalene with the peccatrix, that on the contrary he will only call such a "conjecture *possibly* correct": and yet, when he speaks of Magdalene, he says that by Luke viii. 2, "it is *probably* meant that she had been a person *of most unholy life,* in whom many evil spirits had once taken up their habitation."* In like manner

* "Plain Commentary on the Gospels," in locum. [Mr. Burgon is now Dean Burgon.]

Lange and Olshausen, to be presently cited. All these three writers refer to the parable of our Lord, which we shall immediately mention. Hengstenberg, who is also of course on the same side, draws attention to this parable, which is simply decisive. He says it is the only Scriptural instance, besides that of Magdalene, in which a *sevenfold* demoniacal possession is narrated. It is that recorded in Matt. xii. 43–45 and Luke xi. 24–26, concerning the man, who is cleansed from one evil spirit, but afterwards possessed by seven others; and under the name of demoniacal possession, it throughout undeniably includes *habits of sin freely acquired.*

For instance, Alford is one of those who raise against our present thesis the objection which we are here considering.* Let us observe then his commentary on this *other* sevenfold demoniacal possession. "The direct meaning of the parable," he says (on Matt. xii. 43), describes, under the figure of this sevenfold (or rather eightfold) possession, "the desperate infatuation of the Jews after our Lord's Ascension, their bitter hostility to the Church . . . . their joining in the impieties of Julian." "Another important fulfilment of the prophetic parable," he presently adds, is found when "the religious lives of men shroud themselves . . . . in formality and hypocrisy, till utter emptiness of faith and spirituality has prepared them for *that second fearful invasion of the Evil*

* "What is stated" in Luke viii. 2, he says, "makes the notion *exceedingly improbable*" that Magdalene was the peccatrix (in locum).

One, which is indeed worse than the first." He considers then this eightfold demoniacal possession to exist,—not specially where men have lost all liberty of will,—but on the contrary where, yielding to the temptation of devils, they perform a series of acts free and most detestable. Lange again is by no means confident that the peccatrix is Magdalene. Still he thinks ("Life of Christ," English translation, vol. ii. p. 133) that Luke viii. 2 probably describes Magdalene as having been "rescued from the heavy curse of sin"; and in his commentary on Matt. xii. 43 he says that the fuller demoniacal possession signifies "a voluntary and damnable self-surrender to Satan by a wicked life." Olshausen too (on Luke vii. 36) thinks it "improbable" that the peccatrix was Magdalene; and yet (on Luke viii. 2) considers that Magdalene's "powers and capacities seem to have been surrendered to the ministrations of darkness."

In truth, if the received Catholic view be accepted in its integrity, no words could more aptly apply to the peccatrix, than those of Luke viii. 2. Mary of Bethany had apparently been brought up in innocence and virtue; and at all events, from her circumstances, was entirely exempt from those temptations to sin, which are presented by poverty and distress. Yet she came to lead publicly in some city the life of an abandoned woman. Nothing is more easily credible, than that a course so singularly depraved was occasioned by the agency of evil spirits; who inhabited her, who solicited her from within to acts of sin, and to whose prompting she freely surrendered

her will. He whom she was led by grace so tenderly to love, not only declared her forgiven, but expelled the evil spirits and delivered her from their solicitations.*

A second objection has been urged against us,—which forcibly illustrates how impossible it is to travel long in company with the most pious Protestants, without coming across some display of unintentional profaneness, which shocks and revolts one. The objection is thus expressed by Professor Plumptre: "It is *unlikely* that such an one as the 'sinner' would at once have been received as the chosen companion of Joanna and Salome, and have gone from town to town with them and the disciples" (p. 257). Good God! Certain holy women were travelling in company with our Lord, as He preached the Gospel from city to city, seeking everywhere the most abandoned sinners, and inviting them to repentance, faith and love. Yet a sinner thus converted, and that with a display of evangelical virtues hitherto unparalleled,—who had been commended by the Omniscient for her signal faith and love—is not good enough forsooth to consort with these singular missionaries! Were they Pharisees then and not Christians at all?

* It may be added in this place for the want of a more convenient one, that by identifying both the peccatrix and Magdalene with Mary of Bethany, we answer readily *another* question asked by some Protestants. "How," they inquire, "could the peccatrix have been in circumstances, which fitted her for ministering to Christ from her substance?" (Luke viii. 3.) Very easily, if she belonged to the comparatively wealthy family of Martha and Lazarus.

We will venture to affirm, that Joanna and the rest would have had far more misgivings whether they were fit company for *her*, than whether she was fit company for *them*.

Another consideration must not be omitted from our argument. The peccatrix, from the very nature of the case, was now to shape out for herself a totally new plan of life. Would she, who had thus forced herself into the presence of her Beloved, willingly lose sight of Him? Would she willingly endure the darkness of His absence, if she could sun herself in the light of His presence? There were holy women already travelling with Him; and it is quite incredible that she should not have joined herself to their company. Moreover S. Luke must have seen his reader's inevitable perception of that probability, when he immediately proceeds to recount that Mary Magdalene, "from whom seven devils had gone out," did that very thing, which the converted peccatrix almost certainly *would* have done.

IV.

Our first thesis was, that—putting aside those texts which mention Magdalene—the peccatrix is pointed out in Scripture as identical with Mary of Bethany. Our second has been that—putting aside those texts which mention Mary of Bethany—the peccatrix is pointed out in Scripture as identical with Magdalene. Our third shall be the supplemental one, that—putting aside that passage which mentions the peccatrix—Mary

of Bethany is pointed out in Scripture as identical with Mary Magdalene. We admit that the grounds for the thesis are less cogent, than for the other two; and we will begin therefore by mentioning, that the assertion to which it points has already been shown to be in the highest degree probable. If Mary of Bethany is identical with the peccatrix, and *she* with Mary Magdalene, Mary of Bethany is of course identical with Mary Magdalene. Our present thesis further states, that there are *direct* grounds in Scripture for holding this identity, apart altogether from the middle term of the peccatrix.

"The village of Bethany and its neighbourhood were, at all events, at a later period of our Lord's ministry, a frequent retreat to Him from the controversies and tumults of Jerusalem. See John xviii. 2; Luke xxi. 37; xxii. 39." (Plumptre, p. 79.) In that village dwelt one family especially dear to Him (John xi. 5). One of them especially, Mary, had already been signalized (Luke x. 42) as "having chosen that best part which shall not be taken from her": she it was who, while Martha was engaged in serving, sat at His feet listening to His word, or lavished costly ointment in His honour. It is incredible that she, who so hung on His every word, with whose family He was so intimately bound up, whose own brother He had so recently raised from the dead, should have stayed behind at Bethany, when Jerusalem, the scene of His Passion, was so close at hand. And it is hardly less incredible that she should have remained, throughout her Lord's suffering, at a distance (Matt.

xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40, 41), when others stood close to the Cross (John xix. 25). Moreover, as Hengstenberg points out (p. 18), "she had already presymbolized our Lord's burial" (Matt. xxvi. 12; Mark xiv. 8; John xii. 7); and all the three Evangelists, who mention her anointing Him at Bethany at all, dwell on this particular *aspect* of her action. Was she likely then to give up His actual entombment to the hands of others? to those other two sitting opposite the sepulchre (Matt. xxvii. 61) while she went away? Yet this she did, unless she were Magdalene.

Then again the fact of her brother's resuscitation must have brought her into special sympathy with her Lord's Resurrection. Yet there is no trace, in any one of the Gospels, of any place whatever being assigned to her in reference to that mystery, unless she were Magdalene. Nor of course should we omit the corroborative fact, that at all events her name, like Magdalene's, was "Mary." Moreover, in this case the probability is entirely on one side. We are not aware of any single consideration which has been even alleged, as tending to render *improbable* the identity of these two Maries: all which Protestants have attempted, is to show that there is no *sufficient evidence* of the fact.

V.

As to our three theses, taken independently of each other, our own appreciation of the ground on which they respectively rest would be as follows. We should say that the third is very decidedly more

probable than its contradictory; that the second reaches so high a degree of probability, as to render its contradictory quite improbable; and that our first thesis is almost certain, so strange is the notion that John xi. 2 can refer to a future action. But it would of course be most unfair to treat the theses as though they were *in fact* mutually independent; for (as we have just pointed out) each one of them is distinctly and importantly corroborated by the union of the other two.

Then there is further to be taken into account what we may call the *negative* evidence of Scripture. Consider the holy woman there designated as the converted peccatrix; consider the holy woman there designated as Mary Magdalene; consider the holy woman there designated as Mary of Bethany. In no one catalogue of the holy women throughout the Gospels do two or more persons appear together on the scene, bearing any of these designations. Yet had there really been three corresponding persons,—all three would possess characters so pronounced and elevated, that one would think they must have received prominent mention.

This leads us to a further consideration, which must not be omitted, although it will weigh differently with different people. Is not the *interior character* ascribed to the three so similar as to indicate identity? Mr. Isaac Williams draws this out very forcibly, as regards Magdalene and Mary of Bethany; though in his second edition he speaks less decidedly than in his first. We italicise one or two clauses.

"When we have formed, unconsciously, a picture of Mary Magdalene in our minds, we find that it extremely resembles that which we have unconsciously been forming, at the same time, of the sister of Lazarus. If any one, judging from the circumstances recorded in the Gospels, were to give an accurate description of what he supposed to be the character of either of these, it would be, in great measure, a character of the other also; with this difference, perhaps, that with Mary Magdalene we connect something more of penitential sorrow; with the other, that calmness of piety which belongs to one that had always 'chosen that good part which shall not be taken away from her.' And yet perhaps it may be shown, that there is not sufficient reason for even this supposed discrepancy, either in their histories or their characters.

"The few circumstances recorded of St. Mary Magdalene are such as to excite in us an exceeding interest; we behold her standing among the nearest to our Saviour's Cross, sitting the last at His grave at night, and coming the first there in the early morning; and, more than all, the circumstances of our Lord's interview with her rivet our strongest attention and emotions. So eminent among those holy women for her devoted service; and eminent even among those holy women, in the favour and acceptance of her Lord. Now, in the previous history, we have circumstances recorded of an equal and similar interest in Mary, the sister of Lazarus. The same attachment to our Lord; the same favour expressed towards her. And the occasions on which they are mentioned bring out the same points of disposition in both. *In both the same calm, yet intense devotedness of character; in both a disposition retiring and contemplative; and yet in both, at the same time, earnest and unshrinking.* We have here Mary Magdalene sitting by the sepulchre,

and withdrawing from the busier company of her friends, the Galilean women, who had gone to prepare spices to do honour to their Lord. We have, on another occasion, Mary, the sister of Martha, sitting at Christ's feet to hear His instructions, and, in so doing, separated from her more active sister, who was busied in preparations to do honour to our Lord, by receiving Him worthily. We have Mary Magdalene sitting in grief at His grave. We have the sister of Martha sitting in grief in the house, mourning for her brother Lazarus. . . . In both a depth of feeling, which would be considered contemplative; and yet, in both, it was combined with a most active energy. Under circumstances of the same kind, they both come forward to our notice by a development of a similar character; and yet the conduct of each of them, under those circumstances, is different from that of others on the same occasions. Thus, at the death of Lazarus, we read of Mary, his sister, 'but Mary sat still in the house,' in the position and character of a mourner; but on our Lord's coming, it is said, 'as soon as she heard that, she arose quickly.' The earnest activity which marks this movement, displays also, incidentally, the deep and strong devotedness of her disposition; for the Jews, who knew her, concluded she had gone to sit at the grave, as an action naturally expected of her character and affections, *supposing that she was going to act as we find Mary Magdalene now doing.* The Jews, therefore, which were with her in the house, and comforted her, when they saw Mary, that she rose up hastily, and went out, followed her, saying, 'She goeth unto the grave to weep there.' Now, let this account be compared with that of Mary Magdalene on our Lord's death: the one, as we observed, sat still in the house, mourning; the other now sits still at the grave, mourning. But from that posture the former arose

hastily on hearing of our Lord. And Mary Magdalene is the first, on Sunday morning, before the break of day, to hasten to embalm our Lord; and, again, there is the same active intensity shown, when on perceiving in the twilight that the stone was removed, she hastened to inform the disciples, anticipating even her companions, who waited after her at the place, and saw the Angel. Again, when they come into the presence of our Lord Himself, *there is something very similar in the character displayed by both of them; and yet not similar to anything mentioned of any other of our Lord's followers.* ('On the Passion,' pp. 404-6.)"

As to the peccatrix, since only one circumstance is recorded concerning her, there is not of course the same means of studying her character; but we may say that such a character as that of Magdalene is the result which might have been expected to ensue, from such a circumstance as that of Luke vii. What are the characteristics to be observed, whether in Magdalene or Mary of Bethany? Such as these: comparative indifference to surrounding events; a brooding on her own thoughts; on the other hand extraordinary keenness in listening to her Lord's voice, and extraordinary promptitude in obeying it. Is not this what might have been expected, in one who had been led by the accents of that voice to break suddenly with all which had given her interest and excitement, and who would look therefore mainly to Him for supplying the place of all she had left? And so F. Newman represents the exhibition of Magdalene in the Gospels, as specially setting forth the character of a penitent. "Love to her," as to other penitents, was "as a wound

in the soul, so full of desire as to become anguish. She would not live out of the presence of Him in whom her joy lay: her spirit languished after Him when she saw Him not, and waited on Him silently, reverently, wistfully, when she was in His blissful presence."—(Fourth Discourse to Mixed Congregations.) Indeed we may add, that the character of penitent Saints has ever been contemplative: witness S. Mary of Egypt, S. Pelagia, S. Margaret of Cortona.

VI.

Before closing the exclusively Scriptural part of our argument, something must be said as to *harmonizing* the various New Testament notices of the great Saint whom we are considering. In attempting however such a harmony, we by no means advocate it as certain or even probable, but only as possible. Some Protestants seem to think that the various accounts can*not* be mutually reconciled on the Catholic theory; but if one way of reconciling them is shown to be possible, a hundred others may be possible also. We would suggest then the following.

Martha, Mary and Lazarus (to name them in their probable order of seniority), having lost both parents, lived together in Martha's house in some Galilean village. Some time before the commencement of our Lord's ministry, a great grief fell on this household; for Mary fell into the power of seven devils, and, consenting to their solicitations, led publicly an

abandoned life in some city of Galilee. Martha and Lazarus, by their sorrow, would be more easily weaned from earthly prejudices and interests, and they became beloved disciples of our Lord. Meanwhile Martha of course used every means in her power to reclaim Mary; and when Jesus was to preach in the very city where the latter pursued her infamous calling, Martha persuaded her at least to hear Him.* To avoid further importunity she promised this, little thinking what the issue would be. Her conversion followed, and she joined the other holy women in accompanying her Deliverer through the cities and villages of Galilee. In due course she arrived at her native village,† where Martha (who may easily have travelled so far in the holy company) received them into her house.‡ When Mary departed with the other holy women, Martha and Lazarus had the strongest reasons for abandoning that part of the country altogether. So long as Mary was a sinner, it was important that they should be close at hand to take advantage of every opportunity for reclaiming

* Our readers will remember that this is F. Dalgairns's suggestion.

† Nothing can possibly be more vague than the note of *time* in Luke x. 38; nor are we aware of any difficulty in supposing, that the event there recorded followed very soon after that of Luke vii. 36. In case however there is any difficulty, unknown to us, against such a supposition, we could most easily give a different turn to this particular part of our conjectural harmony.

‡ It may be worth while to point out that S. Luke does not call it "the village in which Martha and Mary *dwelt*," or use any other phrase implying that the latter had latterly been a resident there.

her. But now they would yearn to leave a place crowded with such miserable associations, where their sister's shame was so widely known, and which she was unlikely again to visit. Nor would they have much difficulty in deciding, that they should go into the neighbourhood of Jerusalem: for they well know that our Lord's ministry was to issue in certain mysterious events there to take place; they earnestly desire to witness those events; and there also they will enjoy more of their sister's society. Then they are naturally drawn to Bethany in particular, because in that village dwelt Simon,—once a leper, and perhaps cured by our Lord,—who was connected with them by such intimate family ties, that Martha could with propriety minister in his house at an entertainment as though it were her own, and Mary could take on herself what was the special duty of a hostess to an honoured guest. (Compare Matt. xxvi. 6, and Mark xiv. 3, with John xii. 2, 3.) When they are settled in their new abode, our Lord enjoins Mary to abide with them for some brief time, both as a joy to them, and in many ways a salutary discipline to herself. During this period Lazarus dies, and is raised to life; and the rest follows, as recorded by S. John.

The greatest part of all this—we need hardly say—is purest conjecture. Our only purpose is to show, that the Catholic opinion presents no *difficulty* in the way of harmonizing the various Scriptural notices; and a thousand harmonies may be possible, though only one can be true. One thing is to us very plain: viz. that the earlier Evangelists, for whatever reason,

preserve an *intentional* silence on the household of Mary, Martha, and Lazarus. We will not here consider what reason may be given for this intentional silence; a question on which Professor Plumptre has some excellent remarks (pp. 81-2). We will only point out, that this fact explains the omission, in the earlier Gospels, of all reference to Lazarus's resuscitation; an omission on which great stress is laid by the opponents of Christianity.

VII.

So much then on the testimony of Scripture, considered by its own light. We are next to consider how far the authority of *holy men* should weigh with Catholics—apart from direct Scriptural proof altogether—in favour of the generally received Catholic opinion. So far as the opinion of some holy man has been merely based on his own personal examination and juxtaposition of texts, we do not see how his holiness adds to it any special weight; and it must certainly be admitted that the application to Scripture of what may be called historical criticism, is far better understood in these than it was in earlier days. Yet there are other constituent elements of the question, on which the judgment of holy men possesses, as such, very high authority. For instance, the most devout Catholics of every age have wonderfully agreed in discerning a deep identity of character, in the acts which Scripture respectively ascribes to Magdalene,

to Mary of Bethany, and to the peccatrix: and this agreement should weigh greatly with every pious believer. Then again it is curious how few Protestant commentators—*none* so far as we happen to know—have discerned the singularly high and extraordinary evangelical virtues displayed in the history of Luke vii. This is a fact on which holy Catholics have laid pre-eminent stress; and their judgment on the matter (we think) should carry extremely great weight with any Catholic (if there be any) whose own private examination would not have led him to discern this.

Lastly, we must inquire how far the Church's authority legitimately bears on the question. On this point we would speak with great diffidence; but our own notion is this. The Church, we need hardly say, is the one authorized interpreter of Scripture, in all which relates to faith and morals. Now the most approved writers of every age, with the Church's full sanction, have constantly based highly important lessons, in the matter of faith and morals, on the identity of S. Mary Magdalene with the peccatrix; on a comparison between such repentance, faith, love, on the one hand as are described in Luke vii., and such privileges on the other hand as were enjoyed by the Saint. We doubt whether a Catholic would act piously, or even safely, who, on the strength of his own critical investigations, should permit himself to repudiate the Scriptural *foundation* of those lessons. On the other hand, as regards identifying *Mary of Bethany* with the peccatrix—however irrefragable to our mind is the *Scriptural* argument for such identity

—we do not see that the Church's authority need be taken into account.

VIII.

Reverting now to our Scriptural argument, we would make one final remark. Those elaborate and carefully-reasoned attacks on the inspired history of our Lord, which have proceeded from such writers as Strauss, Renan, and the Tübingen school, have been by no means an unmixed evil. Doubtless they have inflicted on mankind most serious injury; for (to mention nothing else) they have afforded to antitheists of every class a pretext, for eluding that refutation of their theories which is furnished by the Christian evidences. But on the other hand we have of course fullest confidence in the final result, when the battle is fairly fought out. And already these attacks have led the defenders of revealed religion to discover in the Gospels a thousand minute harmonies and coincidences, before latent, which singularly assist the believer in definitely grasping the sacred narrative.

It is to be regretted however, that the work of defence has been so predominantly left in the hands of Protestants. Of course the controversy is to them far more a matter of life and death than it is to Catholics, who have the Church's authority to fall back upon. Still we wish that a larger number of Catholics were devoting themselves to Scripture criticism, than (so far as we know) is in fact the case.

One undesirable consequence resulting from the present state of things has been, that specially Catholic interests have in some sense gone to the wall; and that concessions have been made to unbelievers, which every Catholic would repudiate. This particular case of S. Mary Magdalene is one among a hundred such. Now every Catholic is convinced that the tide of unbelief, now so strongly and rapidly running in, cannot be successfully resisted except by the Rock of S. Peter; and he will earnestly desire therefore—were it only for that reason—that all who wish to defend Christianity should rest on that Rock. But this important end is powerfully promoted by every fresh instance in which it is shown, that there is a real and deep harmony, between characteristically Catholic doctrines or opinions on one side, and the results of legitimate Scriptural criticism on the other. One purpose of our present article has been to do something in this direction.

FATHER COLERIDGE ON THE GOSPELS.

The Public Life of our Lord Jesus Christ. Vol. I. By H. J. Coleridge, S. J. London: Burns & Oates.

[July 1875.]

IN January last we expressed our conviction, that the appearance of this first instalment of F. Coleridge's great work will be the beginning of a new era in the Catholic study of the Gospels. It was with great regret that we found ourselves prevented, by pressure both of time and space, from giving in April such a general exposition of its contents as we had hoped to accomplish; but we must no longer defer paying the debt we owe in this matter, not to F. Coleridge, but to the interests of Catholic truth and piety. Our brief comments indeed will at best be very poor and unworthy of the theme; and we will begin them with what must seem, as coming from a Catholic, a very common-place remark, but of which the bearing (we hope) will soon become apparent.

I.

The fundamental dogma of Christianity may be thus briefly stated. When mankind had fallen, God did not content Himself with doing what would have

fully sufficed for their restoration; with conferring on them pardon for the past under due conditions, and renewed strength for the future. He decreed that He would most unmistakably manifest to them the ineffable tenderness of His love, by personally suffering for their salvation. But since the Divine Nature cannot suffer, God the Son assumed a human nature, created for the very purpose of suffering; and then, clothed in that nature, He proceeded to close a life of bitter sorrow by a death of unparalleled anguish. In the case of those who apprehend this mystery at all worthily, language which on other subjects would appear rhapsodical and wildly extravagant, if applied to this theme will appear tame and inadequate.

But God has added to this a second entirely distinct mercy; a mercy, which by no means unfrequently escapes the explicit notice of Christians, by being, as it were, lost in the effulgence of the former. All which we said above might have been verified *in secret*. Its general truth might have been sufficiently revealed, but its details might have been entirely unknown. The Incarnate God, though suffering in His human nature no less than He has now suffered, might have lived an entirely hidden life, and died an entirely hidden death. Far different has been His choice. To this day all the localities are easily accessible, which were trodden by His sacred steps. He spent three years in habits of most public communication, not only with the disciples whom He was training, but with the multitudes who were afterwards to turn against Him and procure His murder. His death was so public,

that nothing could possibly have been more so; raised aloft as He was on the Cross, to be gazed at by His bitterest enemies, in such sense that every gesture, every movement, every word was exposed to their malignant comments. Lastly, as the obvious complement of this Divine appointment, the memory of His human words and acts was not left to the accidents and uncertainties of human tradition; but a selection from them was made by the Holy Ghost Himself.* And this selection again was by Him committed to an inspired record, the truth and trustworthiness of which was to be authenticated by an infallible Church in every subsequent age down to the end of the world.

It is perhaps hardly too much to say, that this second mercy, though inferior to the first, yet may bear comparison with it. It might be thought a first principle, that the ways and thoughts of God are infinitely above human cognisance; and yet—though this must always of course be in some sense true—yet it is also true, that what may be rightly called, in the simplest and most literal sense, the words and acts of Almighty God, His movements to and fro, the various events which successively occurred to Him, are placed before the humblest of His disciples for study and meditation. This is a mercy, we say, entirely

* "The first object of the Gospels considered as literary works, was not so much history as doctrine; the collection of the facts about our Blessed Lord, on which Christian instruction and doctrine had been founded. No doubt there were other divine purposes which guided the hands of the sacred writers, but this was the first and the chief."—F. Coleridge, p. 141.

distinct from the former. One of its purposes undoubtedly is, that God's ethical character (if we may so express ourselves) may be rightly apprehended by mankind. This character is very far indeed from being sufficiently set forth by the visible course of events; because what men experience is but an infinitesimal portion of His Providence. But by studying the life of Jesus Christ, a Christian learns, e.g. how tender is God's love towards mankind; how singular His predilection towards the poor, the sick, the despised, the reviled; how immeasurably greater is His desire for men's sanctification, than for any other end which they can pursue. This undoubtedly is one great purpose He proposes, by the knowledge He has given of His human words and acts. Another is, that Christians may grow more and more in habits of tender intimacy and familiarity with Him, who is their Creator and Redeemer. For such familiarity, we need hardly add, gives them a power, otherwise (as far as we can see) unattainable, both for personally loving Him, and for making Him their model and example.

II.

Such being the Four Gospels, it might have been anticipated with some confidence, that large portions of them would present serious difficulties of apprehension. Their contents are selected (as we have said) by the Holy Ghost from innumerable human utterances

and actions of Almighty God; and it was of course certain, that a very large proportion of those utterances and actions would be more or less mysterious. Why should we suppose that this latter class would be passed over in the selection? It appertained doubtless to God's love for the little ones of Christ, that many things should be recorded, which may be sufficiently and profitably understood by pious souls, however deficient in learning and ability. But very great benefit is derivable from the further fact, that a large portion of the Gospels is of a different character. It is surely in the highest degree a spiritually elevating and profitable occupation, to study the words and context of any given portion of these holy records; to compare Scripture with Scripture, fact with fact, and passage with passage; to compare facts and words alike with Catholic dogma; and so successively, in each particular case, to arrive at the true intent of something which the Incarnate God has said or done. A nobler intellectual occupation can hardly be imagined.

Dr. Trench, the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin,—who is certainly among the most reverential, orthodox, and satisfying of non-Catholic commentators,—has very well set forth the difficulty which is to be found in various parts of the Gospels; and his words, we think, are well worthy of attention:—

"I have never been able to consent with that which so often is asserted—namely, that the Gospels are in the main plain and easy; and that all the chief difficulties of the New Testament are to be found in the

Epistles. There are, indeed, by the gracious provision of God, abundance of plain things—so plain, that no wayfarer, who seeks his waymarks, need err for lack of such—alike in these and in those. But when we begin to set the hard things of one portion of Scripture against the hard things of another, I cannot admit that they have right who assume it as lifted above all doubt that those of the Epistles infinitely surpass those of the Gospels. How often the difficulties of the Epistles are merely difficulties of form; not of the thought, but of the setting forth of the thought; of the logical sequence, which only requires a patient disentangling, and all is comparatively clear. But in the Gospels it is not the form of the thought, for that for the most part presents little or nothing perplexing; but the thought itself, the divine fact or statement, which itself constitutes the difficulty. Nor, if I am right in affirming it to be so, is this in any way strange. For while there must be deep things everywhere in Scripture, things past man's finding out—else it were no revelation—surely it is nothing surprising that the Son of God, *Who moved in all worlds as in regions familiar to Him;* who was not the illuminated, but the Illuminator of all others; not inspired, but the Inspirer; should utter the words of widest range and mightiest reach, those which should most task even the enlightened spirit of man to understand. . . . .

"The limpid clearness of St. John's style conceals from us often the profundity of the thought, as the perfect clearness of waters may altogether deceive us about their depth; and we may thus be too lightly tempted to conclude that, while St. Paul may be hard, St. John, at all events is easy. I believe this to be very far from the case."—("Studies in the Gospels," p. v.)

It is this noble work then, the exposition of the

Gospels, in which F. Coleridge has engaged, to the signal benefit both of Catholic devotion and Catholic theology. He has made a start in the present volume, and its successor (as he mentions) will probably appear in July. When complete, it will be, as he says, a work "of considerable length and compass"; falling short indeed in these respects of no life of our Lord, which has hitherto appeared in ancient or modern times. One who comes to it mainly as a learner, cannot of course do it any kind of justice; but he may briefly set down one or two impressions, which it has suggested to his mind.

III.

Our first remark is this. Take the analogy of a human philosopher: those who have been carefully trained in his school, and still more those who have been frequently in his company, will catch far more forcibly than others the force and drift of his successive words and acts: they will see real and deep meaning, where others see no meaning at all; and they will see the true meaning of what others misapprehend and pervert. Thus it is those who have been trained in our Lord's own school;—who have been deeply imbued with true doctrine, whether on His Divine Personality or the endowments of His sacred humanity;—above all who have made Him their constant contemplation;—it is these who will most truly sympathize with His words and acts, and see their genuine significance.

F. Coleridge then has laid the true foundation. His memory is richly stored with the thoughts and imaginings of such holy men; while (if it be not impertinent to make such a remark) every page displays his thorough mastery of all Catholic dogma which concerns the Incarnation. We should further add, that in his hands the devotional and practical contemplation of our Blessed Lord entirely preponderates over every other aspect of whatever scene may be in hand.

As to this last-named feature of the book, there is hardly one page which will illustrate it better than any other page. But we may exemplify the admirable use he makes of the meditations of Christian contemplative writers, by the quotation from Ludolph in p. 86, on the scene which must have ensued in the wilderness, when Satan was for the time finally conquered and angels thereupon ministered to the Victor. Or we may adduce a longer passage (pp. 168–172), where the author introduces with great force the comments which have been made by devout Catholics on our Lord's first miracle. Under this head we may also commemorate two or three beautiful extracts from the visions of Sister Emmerich; which he has in no instance however introduced, except where they serve to fill up the details of some scene, which urgently *needed* the being set forth in full detail. As to all this, it will happen no doubt again and again, that some particular significance, given by devout Catholics to this or that passage, will be scouted by Protestant critics as far-fetched and puerile. But if Catholics

were to drop whatever non-Catholics account puerile, they would simply have to change their religion for a different one. And at last "Wisdom is justified by her children." Those who have been nurtured in the love of God and in habits of piety, "have their senses exercised to the discernment of good and evil"; and they can see many a thought to be heavenly and divine in character, on which children of this world look down as the merest foolishness.

Closely connected with what we have been saying, though distinct from it, is the author's introduction of such pious and ascetical remarks, as are naturally suggested by the circumstances on which he is commenting. Some may perhaps think there is a little too much of this; but we must say that to our mind he has as nearly as possible hit the happy mean. His business of course is exposition, not admonition; and in our opinion, he has introduced no other practical applications, except those which emphatically serve to set forth the full significance of what the Evangelists have recorded. We may instance what we mean, and at the same time exemplify the characteristically *Catholic* spirit which pervades the author's reflections, by citing his comment of the passage, in which our Lord promises to Simon the name of Cephas or Peter.

"Thus we see that the Church, the dearest thought of our Lord's Heart after His Eternal Father, was in His mind at this time; and that it was the presence of Simon Peter that, if we may so say, called it up; the two being inseparable in the love of our Lord, as in the Providence of God, Peter and the Church that is

built upon him; as in the Incarnation itself there are two persons never to be separated, Jesus Christ, and His Mother through whom He became Man" (p. 126).

In truth however we find it difficult to enter into any one's state of mind, who can complain of any Gospel commentary on the precise ground of its being too lengthy. Grecian and Roman histories are published of a most voluminous character, and no one grumbles. Sir A. Alison has given fourteen thick octavo volumes to a history of Europe during the first French Revolution, and is not rebuked for his prolixity; in fact, we believe, he is exceeded in length by Thiers. Where the matter is thoroughly solid and good, no one complains of length: or rather no one does so, unless the highest of all possible themes be the one treated. Such a complaint, we repeat, is to us unintelligible. If it is among the noblest, so surely it is also among the most arduous works which can be undertaken, to set forth in their entire bearing, in their deep significance, in their full suggestiveness, the human acts and words of Almighty God. Indeed the very highest endowments and the fullest detail will only enable a writer to accomplish this with *approximate* success. Doubtless in this, as in every other study, there must be manuals and abridgements, for the young and for those who are prevented by adverse circumstances from lengthened investigation. But to us it is perplexing, how leisured and pious Catholics—believing what they do on the Personality of Jesus Christ—can endure to go through life, without attain-

ing the fullest knowledge and apprehension they can, of every act which He performed and every word which He uttered.

And this leads us to another consideration of much importance. It may be almost said, that to write such a comment as F. Coleridge proposes, is to write a "summa theologiæ" for ordinary Christians. The exordium of S. John contains the whole dogma of the Incarnation; his sixth chapter the whole dogma of the Blessed Eucharist; the parables recorded by the Synoptists contain a mass of miscellaneous doctrine. "The Holy Ghost shall remind you of all things which I have spoken to you." He "shall not speak of Himself, but shall speak what things He has heard." "He shall glorify Me, for He shall take of what is Mine and declare it to you" (John xiv. 26; xvi. 13, 14). It would seem that there is hardly one, if indeed there is one, of the Catholic dogmata, which did not receive its first rudimental promulgation, in some evangelically-recorded utterance of our Lord's.* Of course the discussions of scientific theology are absolutely requisite, in order that due light be thrown on these pregnant and rudimental utterances: but these last in their turn react on many a patristic exposition or scholastic argumentation, imparting a freshness and power which it would not otherwise possess. "In these Scriptural words God Incarnate first uttered this dogma"—here surely is an announcement of a most

* [See Cardinal Newman's striking chapter, on "Scripture as a record of our Lord's teaching," in his Anglican work (now republished by him) on the Church's "Prophetical Office."]

touching and practical character. It is this side of theology, which such a writer as F. Coleridge will build up with extraordinary laboriousness and power. And those Catholics, who have no vocation to technical theological study, must derive from such exposition a far deeper, wider, and more vivid knowledge of their religion, than they would otherwise possess.

IV.

We next turn to a somewhat different kind of excellence. In late years the science of criticism has put forth quite a new start and development; and it would be most strange, if the new ways of thought (since they contain much truth) were not capable of throwing important light on the Gospel narrative. We have already said indeed, what profound and accurate apprehension of our Lord's words and acts has been exhibited by those great contemplatives, who understood Him better than others, because they loved Him better and enjoyed more of His intimate familiarity. On the whole however, they have usually fixed their gaze on individual passages, we had almost said on individual verses. Take by way of contrast, such intellectual exercises, as an investigation—in the case of some given discourse—of the thread of meaning which connects its various parts; the drift of the discourse *as a whole;* its suitableness to the particular circumstances under which our Lord was speaking, to the auditory by which He was surrounded, to the stage of His ministry at which He had arrived; &c., &c. Or take again,—in the case of some given dialogue

say with Nicodemus or the Samaritan woman—a careful examination of what was passing in the interlocutor's mind; of how our Lord addressed Himself to that state of mind; of what is the connection between each successive utterance of His and that which preceded and that which followed. Such investigations as these, it would appear, have been more familiar to moderns than to ancients, and perhaps more to Protestants than to Catholics. This fact leads us to mention one characteristic feature of the commentary before us.

F. Newman has more than once set forth, with his usual force of language, the Church's power and duty of what he calls "assimilation." In every age, she has diligently surveyed habits of thought and practice existing outside her own bosom—not merely for the purpose of denouncing what is false,—but also of assimilating and turning to good service what they might contain of truth. We have ourselves more than once ventured to urge the importance of this being done at present, within the sphere of *philosophy*. It is of great moment—so we have submitted—that non-Catholic philosophy should be diligently studied by children of the Church,—not merely (though this of course chiefly) for the purpose of guarding the Catholics against those deplorable aberrations which are its predominant characteristics,—but also of appropriating and assimilating such truths as it may contain, to which Catholics have not hitherto given sufficient recognition. F. Coleridge has acted on this principle within his own special line of thought, and

has evidently made much study of Protestant writers. We need hardly say indeed, that whatever benefits could be obtained from modern criticism, would be most dearly purchased, if for their sake less store were set on that most precious possession, the Church's traditional interpretation of Scripture. But in the present author's hands,—not only this is preserved in its full and exclusive supremacy,—but in fact it is placed throughout in fuller and clearer light, by the very circumstance that the results of modern criticism have been duly incorporated and assimilated.

We have already mentioned one great advantage obtained from modern criticism: viz. in tracing the thread of our Lord's discourses or dialogues; discerning the appropriateness of each to its attendant circumstances; and the light again obtainable from those circumstances, towards its true interpretation. F. Coleridge achieves this task in a very masterly way; nor in fact do we happen to know any other commentator, Catholic or Protestant, who (to our mind) at all equals him in its performance. We may refer, as an instance, to his treatment of our Lord's dialogue with the Samaritan woman, and His following address to the Apostles (pp. 300–326). On the surface it is very far from easy to apprehend the drift and current of this scene; but the author works it up with complete success, into a consistent and intelligible whole. In particular we may mention the well-known difficulty (John iv. 35–38) about "sowers and reapers." F. Coleridge unites the two sentences, quoted by our Lord as proverbial (verses 35, 37), into one single proverb, which he

supposes to have been current: "Four months and the harvest cometh; one soweth and another reapeth." And taking this as his foundation, he brings out with singular force (pp. 323–327) the full bearing of our Lord's address to the Apostles. Nor is this all; for this suggestion as to the meaning of the proverb, does him service for another purpose entirely different. As we shall presently point out at more length, if there is one feature more characteristic of the volume than another, it is the author's appreciation of the Gospels in their *chronological* aspect. Now in this particular instance, he is able to use his interpretation of our Lord's words as a complete reply to a certain exposition of verse 35, which would oppose great difficulty in the way of a satisfactory arrangement of Gospel chronology.

We must admit frankly, that we do not think the author equally successful in every part of our Lord's colloquy with Nicodemus (pp. 253–275); but this is perhaps among the very most difficult passages in all the Gospels. Certainly we are not ourselves acquainted with any commentator, who impresses us as more successful in treating it than F. Coleridge. But we expected greater increase of light from him on the subject, than we have in fact attained.

There is another mode of illuminating the Gospel text, over and above that just mentioned, which is a speciality of modern times, and has been perhaps more cultivated by non-Catholics than by children of the Church. We mean a study of the religious opinions, the domestic habits, the political condition,

the physical circumstances, of contemporary Palestine,—as often solving some difficulty which would not otherwise be solved, or giving far greater liveliness and freshness to some word or act of our Lord than would be otherwise discerned. F. Coleridge mentions in particular (p. xiii.) the great advantage of being acquainted with "local knowledge and acquaintance with Biblical scenery and antiquities"; and quotes some French infidel as saying, that "a visit to the Holy Land is like a fifth Gospel in the intelligence which it conveys concerning our Lord's life." We are not aware whether F. Coleridge has visited the Holy Land; but in other respects we do not believe that any modern writer exceeds him, in his mastery of such knowledge as we are here mentioning. At the same time he is very careful to keep it in due subordination, and prevent it from overriding the higher purposes of exposition. Indeed he speaks with much severity of those non-Catholic commentators who pursue a different course.

There is a further feature of Protestant commentaries, on which a word may be said in passing: it is sometimes called—especially as practised by one well-known Anglican dignitary—"picturesque theology." It would be an utter mistake to suppose, that it is a specially modern habit, to form this or that individual scene of our Lord's life into a group, which may be placed distinctly before the imagination, and which may be exhibited indeed by painting or sculpture. Against any such supposition, we need only appeal to the great stress laid by S. Ignatius on "composi-

tion of place"; to such visions as those of Sister Emmerich, or again Mary of Agreda; and also to the great Catholic painters. What Protestants have added to this, has been enlivening and enriching these pictures, by introducing such matters as the scenery of Palestine and the contemporary habits of secular life. F. Coleridge has not failed to derive due instruction from such writers; but on the whole they are, we think, more antipathetic to the instincts of Catholic piety, than any other class of Protestant commentators. It would seem their constant effort to minimize the distinction between things sacred and things secular; to assimilate, as nearly as they can, the Gospel narratives to a record of merely human events. In them moreover is exhibited in its extreme degree a peculiarity, which is shared however with them by all Protestant commentators, and which is a source of unremitting distress to the Catholic student: we mean, that their deplorable ignorance of dogma is constantly issuing in some unintentional irreverence to Him, Whose Divine Personality they so grievously fail to apprehend.

The following passage may here be advantageously placed before our readers, as illustrating what we have said:—

"The use of the Gospels for prayer and contemplation suggests that Christian exercise of the imagination of which mention has already been made, and thus far, at all events, we may safely, if sparingly, avail ourselves of the beautiful pictures which have been drawn for us in contemplations like those to which reference has been made, just as we should of

an actual picture drawn for us by Fra Angelico, or any other painter whose inspirations might be as pure, as holy, and as theological as his. Nor should we shrink, even in a narrative which aims at being historical, from helping ourselves now and then by the consideration of what we know must either have been, or be like what actually was, although there may be no distinct assertion to that effect from the pen of an evangelist. For there are facts in our Lord's life which are generally assumed as certain in the Church; as, for instance, that He ordained some at least of the Apostles priests or bishops at the Last Supper, or that he showed Himself after the Resurrection first of all to our Blessed Lady: assumptions as to which the Saints not only use words of sanction and toleration, but language which implies some censure on those who do not see that it could not have been otherwise" (p. 141).

And here we may make an episodical remark. There is a very large number of sincere Christians in England, who (whether or no by their own fault) are external to the true fold. These persons profess to derive their creed from Scripture, and at all events are regular readers of the sacred volume. It may be under various circumstances a great advantage, if such men are brought to admit, how far deeper and more satisfying an interpretation of our Lord's words and acts is provided by Catholic theology, than is otherwise attainable. Let any fair-minded and competent Protestant be induced to compare such a commentary as F. Coleridge's with the best he can obtain in his own communion: say, e. g., with Mr. Isaac Williams's, which is in many respects written on a similar plan. He will be obliged to admit how

far superior is the former in completeness, in depth, and above all in confronting the sacred text as a whole. With many Protestants, a first-rate Catholic commentary is (we may say) *the one* appropriate and hopeful method for their conversion.

Again, many a Protestant labours still under the notion, that Catholics put our Blessed Lord in the background, in order to find room for our Blessed Lady and the Saints. Such a work as that before us must (one would think) give a death-blow to this long-lived delusion.

We return however to the general course of our remarks; which is concerned with the religious interest of Catholics, rather than of Protestants. And in what we have already said we have in fact included one special excellence of this commentary, which it will be better however to name separately. Every scene which the author describes, he places with singular vividness before his reader in every detail; and constantly succeeds, by the very course of his narrative, in solving difficulties without even mentioning them. In this again we know of no other commentator who is at all his equal.

V.

But the particular which, more than any other, distinguishes the present commentary from those hitherto written, is its way of dealing with the question of what are called "harmonies." As far as we know, F. Cole-

ridge is the very first writer who has acted on what seems to us the true view of this question. The ancient Catholic writers,—whose attention (as we have already said) was fixed rather on individual verses and passages one by one, than on a larger field of view,—attached little importance to the *order* of Gospel events. Even had they otherwise been disposed to lay more stress on this particular topic, they would have been prevented from doing so to any great purpose, by a circumstance mentioned by F. Coleridge in p. x. S. Augustine's harmony is based throughout on the principle, that S. Matthew's order of events is the standard to which the other Gospels should be conformed. S. Augustine's authority was so deservedly great in the Church, that this principle was for centuries assumed as a matter of course; whereas F. Coleridge mentions it as "now generally admitted by students on the subject, that the order of S. Matthew's Gospel is not chronological" at all (p. xi.). Protestant writers then of the more orthodox school, as was not altogether unnatural, have seen keenly the difficulties besetting those schemes of harmony which had been perfunctorily accepted; and failing to find others entirely satisfactory, have more and more tended of late to the opinion, not only that there is no discoverable order of connection in the synoptical Gospels, but that a large number of actual *mistakes* must be admitted to exist in their recital of subordinate details. F. Coleridge maintains on the contrary, that "to trace the onward march of the manifestations of our Lord, the gradual training of His Apostles, the

development of His moral or doctrinal or mystical teaching" (p. xii.), is on the one hand a task which can be performed with continually increasing success, while on the other hand its performance must throw a flood of new light on the inspired record. We cannot do better, than place before our readers his own statement of the case.

"No perfect life of our Lord can ever be written by human hand, because very large portions of it are entirely hidden from us; and even as to those parts which we know most about, there is much more that we do not know. What Christian criticism can do is to attempt, as far as may be, to restore, if the expression may be used, out of the materials which are furnished by the Evangelists, the Life of our Lord as it was known, in its external facts, to the Apostles and those who were familiar with Him, before the Gospels were written; to shed upon it the light which is furnished by Christian theology, from St. Paul and St. John to the Catholic writers of modern times:— and then, to go on to point out the purpose and method, in accordance with which each several Gospel was composed. This may be a difficult task, a task which is impossible, perhaps, to accomplish completely; but it does not follow that it should not be attempted, or that nothing short of perfect success can be valuable and profitable in advancing our knowledge of our Lord. Anything of the kind, that is true and sound as far as it goes, must be very precious; and it would almost seem as if Christian students were intended to exercise their minds and powers in industry of this kind, by the very fact that it has pleased God that the records of our Lord's life should be divided, as they are between four several witnesses" (pp. xii. xiii.).

We may supplement these remarks, by some others which appeared in the "Month" for last May.

"The criticism of the Gospels, in so far as it applies to the arrangement of the events which are related by the four several Evangelists, not always in the same order, and to the same careful discrimination of the method and purpose of each one of the four, is to some extent a creation of later times, and has perhaps still to pass through more than one phase before it can be said to be completed. No one will certainly be inclined to assert that the exact chronological order and sequence can be assigned with perfect certainty to every single act and saying of our Divine Lord as recorded by the Evangelists. But this is only one of the extremes into which Gospel critics may be misled. There is another, and perhaps more fatal mistake—that of supposing that the Evangelists follow no method, and that they are constantly inaccurate; for inaccurate they must be if they contradict each one another. This error is perhaps more important at the present day than the other which we have mentioned—more important on account of the sceptical direction in which the public mind in England is at present turned, in consequence of the many flaws in the logical armour of the High Church and 'orthodox' party, who are so constantly abandoning the only positions from which the faith can be successfully defended, because they fear that what those positions really cover is the Catholic faith, and the Catholic faith alone. . . . .

"The present volume has been written under the sincere belief, confirmed by many years of thought and study, that the Life of our Lord, as far as it is at present the will of God that we should be acquainted with it, was really before the mind's eye of the Evangelists as they wrote, and that it is not impossible to reconstruct it, if the word may be used, at least in

its main and determining outlines, out of the materials which they have collected, and which they have in their own Gospels dealt with after methods of their own, for which they had plain and grave reasons. This belief implies that there was a certain order and progress in our Lord's life from the first to the last, according to which He was manifested by the providence of His Father, first in this light, and then in that, according to the anticipations of type and prophecy, and as the occasions for the several kinds of evidence concerning Him succeeded one to another. . . .

"The writer's object is to furnish Catholic readers with suggestions which may help them in the intelligent meditation and contemplation of all that belongs to our Lord's history and character, and to the manner in which it was gradually manifested, whether to the people at large, or to thoughtful and devout minds, such as those of S. Peter and the other Apostles" (pp. 105--107).

It is with intense interest that we wait for the gradual unfolding of this view in the successive volumes, which are now to be expected, and which will go over ground even more interesting than that covered by the one before us.

In these days of unbelief, there is an invaluable benefit—entirely distinct from those already mentioned —which this commentary cannot fail to confer. It will be impossible for any one to study with simplicity its series of volumes, without receiving the most deeply-seated conviction that the narrative is substantially true. The profound harmony and orderly progressiveness of its various parts, the inimitable

touches of nature, the divine depth and beauty of our Lord's words and acts,—to all these F. Coleridge will do fullest justice; and taken in combination, they cannot but engender in the reader's mind the conviction we have named.

VI.

It remains to consider the particular form, in which F. Coleridge has placed before the world the result of his long studies and mature deliberation. On this subject again, it will be better that he speak for himself:—

"It has not been my object to make the present work either a record of all the opinions which have been maintained on the various points treated in it, or a book of reference for authorities. I have given the name of the author whom I have followed in cases where a reference to the work will be of advantage to the student, but otherwise I have been content with the result of researches, which I trust have been sufficiently wide and industrious to render it safe to say, that no important opinion or authority has been altogether neglected. The readers of many modern books on the Gospel history may well be frightened at the immense number of names of authors and books which meet their eyes at the bottom of the page, and they will sometimes be wearied at the long discussions in which all conceivable opinions and conjectures are dealt with and discussed. The truth is, that the field has been overgrown with critical writings without, as I venture to think, any proportionate benefit to true criticism; and it would be a real loss to the cause of

truth if it were to be considered an established rule, that no one should deal with the critical questions connected with the Gospel history unless he has read all that has been written before him. Many authors merely repeat, either at second-hand or as the result of their own speculations, opinions which have been put forward over and over again, and perhaps as often answered; and the same may be, in its degree, said of the interpretations of the words of our Lord or of others which are recorded in the Gospels. I have endeavoured to keep down, as far as possible, anything that may interfere with the direct onward flow of the narrative or the commentary, by such discussions as rather exhibit the process by which a conclusion has been arrived at than add anything to the clearness of the doctrine or the history. Moreover any one who has studied the Gospels continually and critically will be aware that he is often unable to trace to its right author a view of facts or an interpretation of words, which has fixed itself on his mind after much reading and thought; and I trust that this will be an excuse for the paucity of acknowledgments and of references to authorities in the present volume. It has been written in the midst of occupations and distractions, such as would certainly have prevented me from undertaking it, if I had not thought it better to do what I could rather than wait for greater leisure which might never come" (pp. xvi.—xviii.).

An objection may be imaginably entertained against the plan thus sketched, on the ground that it unduly commits the readers to F. Coleridge's own view, and leaves them no sufficient scope for individual judgment. But such an objection (we think) would proceed on a complete misapprehension of the main requisite for acquisition of knowledge, whether in

sacred literature or profane. It is only by allowing others to judge for him in the first instance, that a man can acquire any power of reasonably judging for himself at last. Those who shall in the first instance have surrendered themselves unhesitatingly to F. Coleridge's guidance, will have acquired a knowledge of the sacred text, which will give them real right—such a right as they could not possess without some similar course of study—to a judgment of their own, between any given interpretation adopted by F. Coleridge and some other which may be suggested as preferable.

But what is chiefly to be remembered is this. The one main ultimate object, at which every Catholic must aim in a Gospel commentary, is to help the student in acquiring such knowledge of our Blessed's Lord's life in the flesh, as may generate familiarity with the thought of Him, and so issue in fuller and keener apprehension of God's Attributes, and generally in increased piety and devotion. But though all Catholics who write on the Gospel narrative must regard this as their *ultimate* end, there are several who do not make it their *immediate* one. Those e.g. who write on such a plan as Maldonatus's, lay down an invaluable foundation for a devotional superstructure; but then the persons who are to supplement such works by erecting such superstructures, are not so readily found. Maldonatus is so powerful an expositor, that a Protestant Archbishop (Dr. Trench) goes out of his way to eulogize the Jesuit Professor, as among the most successful commentators who have ever written.

Yet no one would call Maldonatus's a *devotional* book; nor indeed would ecclesiastical students, as a general rule, include their Scriptural studies in the *ascetical* portion of their training. For our own part, we greatly prefer the method of those who, like F. Coleridge, pursue immediately, what all admit should be the ultimate end of their labours.

We would emphatically recommend however those who have this volume in their hands, to make it a matter of study and not of mere reading. It is not a work to be perused throughout and then laid aside. On the contrary, there should be frequent intervals, during which what has been read is made a matter of painstaking meditation and reflection. It is our belief, that those who so use it will in general find, that its use has marked a memorable era both in their devotional and their intellectual life.

VII.

The Public Life of Jesus Christ. Vol. II.: *The Preaching of the Beatitudes.* By H. J. Coleridge, S.J. London: Burns & Oates.

[October 1875.]

In our last number we set forth as best we could the great and unique excellence of F. Coleridge's work, both as regards its general plan, and as regards the execution of that plan in the one volume which had appeared. Every one would have expected that the second volume would be more interesting even than

the first, from the more interesting nature of the portion of the Gospels therein treated. But few, we think, would have been prepared for so magnificent an exposition as that of the Beatitudes, which occupies more than half the volume; and which to our mind indefinitely excels every other commentary which is in use whether among Catholics or pious Protestants. In fact the Beatitudes cannot receive any worthy interpretation at all, except by means of that *expository* treatment, which is one of F. Coleridge's chief peculiarities.

F. Coleridge's style appears to us singularly forcible and beautiful. But what especially impresses us, is the profound ascetical treatment given to each successive Beatitude; and the manner in which each is shown to arise, with a characteristically divine fulness of aptitude, from that which has preceded. The whole may be considered an ascetical treatise perfect in itself, no less than a Biblical commentary. F. Coleridge shows himself thoroughly versed in the great Catholic ascetical writers, and we are delighted to find that

"It may be hoped that portions of this and other great ascetical works of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which are either inaccessible from their rarity, or formidable on account of their great length, may be translated or abridged in the series of ascetical works, which has been commenced under the same management as that to which the present volume belongs" (p. 229).

We may take indeed the present opportunity for

testifying, what is everywhere felt among English Catholics; viz. the very great benefits conferred by the English Jesuits in this "Quarterly Series."

We must indulge in the gratification of transferring to our own pages some extracts from this volume; and we hope that, by doing so, we may induce those of our readers who have not yet entered on a study of the work, to lose no time in commencing.

In the following passage the author draws attention to an undeniable fact, which some Catholics are perhaps afraid of looking in the face:

"The sacrifice of the Cross is of infinite efficacy, and by virtue of it a new Creation has come into existence. But *the actual results* of what our Lord has done and suffered and purchased correspond rather to *the disappointment which He allowed to cloud His soul* at the time of the Agony in the Garden, than to the intrinsic power of His work, or even to the glowing language in which the fruit of that work has been described by the Evangelical Prophet. The souls in which the grace which our Lord has left behind Him is allowed to accomplish all that it can accomplish, are few indeed; and what is true of single souls is true of that multitude and community of single souls of which the Church is made up, and of the teeming world around her, which she has the mission as well as the power to convert and transform and beautify, with all the glories of the creation of grace. She shows her divine origin, her heavenly mission, her supernatural gifts, by what she does, because any one of her countless triumphs is the result of a power and a presence which is nothing short of divine. If she had suffered greater losses and endured more relentless opposition and persecution than she has actually suffered, she

would still have proved herself to be what she claims to be by evidence which no human reason could gainsay. But what is enough for testimony is not enough for complete success, and it is for a witness that the Gospel is to be preached to all nations" (p. 148).

Here is a vigorous comment on the "hunger and thirst after justice." The little reference at starting to an ant-hill has a certain playfulness about it, which of course would not often be in place in such a treatise as the present:—

"The condition of man in this life is one of craving and desire. The world is full of restless unremitting activity. If an ant-hill is disturbed, we see the hundreds of ants which belong to it running to and fro in what seems to us to be wild confusion, and as far as it appears, they do nothing else but run about. Do not the blessed citizens of heaven look down thus upon the world of men below them, and might they not wonder at what is the end and what the gain of all the actions which they behold? The external activity of mankind, whether it be in pursuit of wealth, honour, or in the pursuit of pleasure—for the silly butterflies of the world are as busy in their way as the working bees—is yet nothing in comparison to the seething confusion within, the perpetual straining of desires, hopes, ambitions, the constant working of the passions of every kind toward their objects, indifferent or bad, shameful or gainful, so that it would seem that the mind and heart can never live without some food in the way of complacency or desire, aversion or displeasure. Our merciful Father, Who knows the restlessness of our nature, because it is always striving after its end under some form or other, true or false, fantastic or rational, has met our needs by giving us what to love and what to aim at, and so He has made

it possible for our desires to work themselves in perpetual activity and at the same time ennoble themselves, elevate us, place us nearer and nearer to Him, and heap up for us infinite treasures and ineffable joys, which are indeed true treasures and true joys, in the life to come. Even in the natural order it is constantly seen how a noble ambition, or some sudden call of duty or patriotism which requires devotion and self-sacrifice, or even the having a new purpose given to a life by means of some deep personal attachment, makes men out of boys, and serious workers out of triflers and fops, and in this way develops and improves whatever is good and capable of being made better in the character of those who are thus possessed. And it is of the nature of such ambitions or desires as are thus generated to become engrossing and absorbing, and to extinguish, by excluding, all other concupiscences. What must it be, then, when this hunger and thirst after all the mighty and fertile range of virtues rise up in the soul? The lower passions are at once lulled to sleep, the appetites are tamed, reason regains her sway, the voice of conscience is louder and clearer, the mind becomes illuminated by faith, the will becomes robust and decided, the whole man becomes larger and stronger and nobler, his thoughts and principles and aims are insensibly changed till they become the thoughts and principles and aims of the children of God. This is a wonderful benefit, to be understood best by comparing the misery of a soul which is left to grovel in the filth of lower desires with the pure and lofty activity of the saints whose conversation is in heaven" (pp. 231–3).

The foundation of all spirituality—we need hardly say—is the Catholic doctrine on the end of man. The

same doctrine, says F. Coleridge, is "the key of the riddle of life."

"At no hour and under no circumstances are we not surrounded by opportunities of virtue, nor is there anything which comes across our path, good or bad, spiritual or material, which cannot be as it were turned to gold for the enrichment of our souls in the true treasures of heaven. Man's life is short and feeble, and he can do but little in any other way. The loftiest intellectual flights are not in themselves very much; the discoveries of science, the guesses of philosophy, the feats of statesmanship, the grand achievements of art, the material conquests of the physical forces of nature which can be compassed for the service of man, these are great indeed in their degree, but they are but little, after all, above the common actions and works of men. The loftiest mountains of the earth are but the most insignificant elevations of its surface when compared to its circumference; and in the same way the noblest things which genius and industry have brought about are altogether insignificant in relation to the nature and end of man, except as far as they partake of the character of moral or spiritual elevation. Man is one of the weakest of God's creatures, except that he can use grace and choose good and merit the eternity of heaven. And this he can do in every moment of his life; this all men alike can do, young and old, rich and poor, learned and ignorant; this is the one dignity of humanity, a dignity more precious than diamond mines or streams flowing with gold, more fertile and fruitful of blessings than the cornfields or the vineyards of the whole earth" (p. 235).

These are but specimens, taken almost at random, from the spiritual treasures to be found in the volume.

VIII.

The Sermon on the Mount. By H. J. Coleridge, S.J. London: Burns & Oates.

[July 1876.]

It is just a year since we drew attention to the special character of this commentary; and expressed our sense of the singular benefits which F. Coleridge is therein conferring, on English Catholics primarily, but ultimately on the whole Christian world. The work has now reached its third volume, which lies before us. We can hardly say more of it in the way of notice, than emphatically to repeat what we said last July on the general character and value of the commentary; and to testify that the two subsequent volumes have even surpassed our expectation, in what seems to us the completeness and general excellence of their execution.

We cannot doubt that the effect produced by the work is already considerable: but its publication is peculiarly the kind of enterprise, in which the ultimate results are out of all proportion to the initial movement. Those who are *at once* most deeply impressed by it, are precisely those who are most likely to influence the mind of others, and who are most sure to do so in due course. F. Coleridge begins (if we may so express ourselves) by generating the atmosphere itself, in which his utterances will at a later period

sound forth with a distinctness and emphasis that must arrest the attention of all.

If the volume before us were simply an ascetical treatise,—every thoughtful reader would be profoundly impressed by its fulness, depth, and perspicacity; by its subtlety in setting forth the adaptation of Christian doctrine for the loftiest needs of human nature. In this respect, however, the volume essentially differs from an ascetical treatise, that the writer is not pursuing a plan and purpose of his own, but illustrating in pregnant and unforced comment the successive words of God Incarnate. The reader is not mastering some scheme of ascetic theology, but learning to "live on every word which proceedeth from the mouth of God." It is easy enough doubtless to make our Lord's words texts as it were to a series of sermons: but there is not a sentence of F. Coleridge's which can fairly be called digressive; not a sentence which does not assist in apprehending more fully and precisely what it is which our Blessed Lord is saying. The effect of such a study on the whole interior life is a theme which we cannot help suggesting, for the consideration of those who are more competent than ourselves to do it justice.

If any readers are disappointed—we have not heard of any being so—at the complete absence of *narrative* in this particular volume, we would remind them that the author cannot of course choose his own order of arrangement. If it pleased our Blessed Lord—as indeed was evidently most suitable—to preface the chief part of His active ministry by a detailed exposi-

tion of the Evangelical Law, His dutiful disciple must adopt the same order in a systematic comment. But as there are several of F. Coleridge's characteristics which show to especial advantage in his treatment of our Lord's discourses,—so there are others, perhaps equally important, which will be more prominently exhibited in the future volumes, concerned as these will mainly be with the miracles and other acts of our Lord's public life.

We may mention one feature of this commentary as very characteristically Catholic. The author draws attention to what Protestant expositors of course fail to discern: the constant references to His *Church*, which underlie our Lord's teaching in the Sermon on the Mount. These references sometimes need a little care to be distinctly seen; but (when pointed out) they carry with them their own evidence of having been really intended.

THE GOSPEL NARRATIVE OF THE RESURRECTION.

Christian Evidences, Popular and Critical. By R. H. Hutton, ("Contemporary Review," July, 1876). London: Strahan & Co.

[October 1876.*]

I.

THERE is probably no writer in England who has done much more for national religion than Mr. Hutton. He has thoroughly the ear of the public, and is always to the fore whenever the interests of piety and morality are concerned. Whether it be from a philosophical or literary or political quarter that those interests are threatened, he is ever prompt and powerful in repelling the attack; and we are quite confident that the good effects he has produced are far deeper and wider, even than appears on the surface.

* [The following Essay is extracted from a longer article, which was intended to be the first of a brief series, drawing the Catholic reader's attention to certain very valuable remarks on the historical argument for Christianity, which had recently been made by Protestant writers. Considering all that was on my hands, it was perhaps rather wild on my part to start this additional project. Certainly I never found leisure to pursue it further, though I had accumulated materials of (I think) some importance. That part of the article however, which is here reprinted, will be found (I hope) to possess a certain completeness of its own, apart from the integral series in which it was to have been contained.]

It is only what might have been expected therefore, that the treatise of his which we have named at the head of our article contains many remarks on the historical argument for the truth of Christianity, which are both original and very valuable. In particular Mr. Hutton does great service by the very prominent place, among the historical arguments for Christianity, which he assigns to the great central miracle of the Resurrection. And he does another great service also (according to our humble judgment) in assigning the chief place, among the external proofs of that miracle, to S. Paul's very express testification of its universal reception in the Christian body: a testification contained in those very epistles, which are admitted as genuine by every extremest infidel of our day. All this however makes us the more regret, that he does such signal injustice to the *Gospel* narrative of the Resurrection; and it is on this particular feature of his work, that we propose to comment in our present paper. These are his words; and we italicize those to which we shall specially refer.

"Amid the discrepancies which I freely admit in the Gospel accounts of the Resurrection, it is notable that S. Paul's statement agrees with that in the third Gospel, that S. Peter was the first Apostle who was a witness of the Resurrection, and that all the accounts alike agree that Jesus was seen by all the eleven Apostles together, though the Gospel called S. Matthew's only mentions such a meeting in Galilee, while the early fragment appended to S. Mark seems to agree with S. Luke, S. John, the Acts, and apparently S. Paul, in placing the earliest and most

important meeting with the eleven Apostles in Jerusalem. It must be frankly admitted, however, that while the Gospel of S. Mark ends with the statement that the sepulchre was found empty, and with a prophecy of a meeting to take place in Galilee,—the addition describing Christ's appearances in Jerusalem being almost certainly of a different though early origin,—*none of the extant accounts agree closely either with each other or with S. Paul's later summary of the facts.* The first Gospel speaks of no appearance, except to the women, in the neighbourhood of the sepulchre, and of but one meeting with the Apostles 'in a mountain in Galilee,' and adds, 'When they saw Him they worshipped Him, but some doubted,' which reminds us of the story of Thomas's doubts given in the fourth Gospel alone, the *scene of which, however, is there expressly described as being in Jerusalem.* The account in the third Gospel is virtually identical with that in the early addition to Mark, recording the appearance to two disciples on their walk to Emmaus, and then to the eleven as they sat at meat, but agreeing with the fourth Gospel in making the first appearance of the risen Christ that seen by Mary Magdalene. The fourth Gospel differs from all the other accounts in describing the first appearance to the assembled Apostles as taking place to ten of them only, Thomas being absent, while only the second, a week later, included all the eleven, and in describing a meeting with seven disciples on the shores of the Lake of Galilee at some later time not defined. Of the appearance to James recorded by S. Paul we have no other account at all, nor of the appearance to above five hundred brethren at once. I should add that the command to the Apostles recorded in the third Gospel, to stay in Jerusalem till after Pentecost was passed, makes *the prediction in the first and second Gospels that the first meeting was to take place in Galilee, and the*

assertion in the first that it actually did so, still less in harmony with the other narratives.

I think every candid person will admit that this condition of the merely external evidence is not of the kind which any one would wish for the purpose of establishing by direct testimony a very marvellous and unprecedented event. But I think every candid person will also admit that it is just the sort of evidence we might expect if there had been no attempt to take records at the time, a good number of accounts (narrated by different persons) of different appearances in different places, *a certain amount of local prepossession in favour of Galilee as the appropriate place for Christ's renewed intercourse with His disciples,* and a complete conviction that Christ after his Resurrection had been seen so often and by so many persons that there was no real dispute about the matter. As I have said before, *the only point on which all accounts agree* is, that certainly all the eleven, and if the Acts can be relied on, all the twelve (including Matthias), had been witnesses of the Resurrection" (pp. 218, 9).

In addition to various subordinate statements which we shall consider in due course, Mr. Hutton here makes two fundamental affirmations. He affirms (1) that S. Luke was under the firm conviction, that our Blessed Lord did not appear to His Apostles after the Resurrection, except only in Jerusalem: insomuch that the Evangelist (in Mr. Hutton's view) describes our Lord Himself (xxiv. 49) as having enjoined the Apostles on the very day of the Resurrection, not to leave Jerusalem before Pentecost. (2) Mr. Hutton further affirms by manifest implication, that S. Matthew was entirely unaware of any appearances to

the Apostles in Jerusalem.* And Mr. Hutton explains S. Matthew's supposed ignorance, as caused by the prevalence of "a certain amount of local prepossession, in favour of Galilee as the appropriate place for Christ's renewed intercourse with His disciples."

Of course—holding as we do, on extrinsic grounds, that every statement made by every Evangelist in this as in every other part of the Gospels is *true*—we maintain, as a matter of *intrinsic* argument, that no one of these statements is inconsistent with any other. And this is the contention on which we are now to insist.

Let us begin then by looking at those alleged discrepancies of S. Matthew and S. Luke, on which far the chief stress is laid. Certainly S. Matthew does not *say* that our Lord did not appear to the Apostles in Jerusalem; and certainly S. Luke does not *say* that He did not appear to them in Galilee.† The utmost which can be alleged is this. If readers—it may be urged—had no other account to guide them except S. Matthew's, they might naturally enough infer that Christ did not appear to the Apostolic body in Jerusalem; and if they had no other account to guide them except S. Luke's, they might naturally enough infer that He did not appear to the Apostolic body in Galilee. But more careful examination will show the inquirer—so we maintain—that these inferences, however primâ

* This, we say, is most manifestly Mr. Hutton's implication: because he could not class S. Matthew's silence on any manifestation to the Apostles at Jerusalem among the "*discrepancies*" in the Gospel accounts, unless he understood that silence as implying *denial* of those manifestations.

† Mr. Hutton's reference to xxiv. 49 is (we venture to think) very easily disposed of, as will be seen in the sequel.

facie plausible, are fallacious. Accordingly we now propose to examine the concluding chapters of the Gospels from this point of view. We propose to show that, neither as regards this nor any other less fundamental particular, do these chapters throw any real difficulty in the way of believing, that the Gospel accounts of the great events which they testify, are thoroughly true in every detail.

We must explain indeed at starting, that we do not admit the existence of any *special* difficulty whatever in these chapters, as compared with other parts of the Gospels. There are certain characteristics of composition, which are displayed throughout the Gospels. And the four Gospel accounts of the Resurrection (we say) may be easily harmonized, if we only assume that the Evangelists display these characteristics in their concluding no less than in their earlier chapters. This is the argument which will occupy our article. As an *argument* of course it is purely negative: it includes no more than an answer to objections. Nevertheless such an examination as we propose to institute will have (we expect) its positive effect also. It will tend, we think, greatly to foster in a devout Christian what we may call his living sense, that the holy narratives, on which he so dearly loves to ponder, are no "cunningly-devised fables," but on the contrary true records of the Incarnate God.

II.

We will commence our proposed task, by setting forth as forcibly as we can the chief of all the alleged

contradictions. We will exhibit those features in the First and Third Gospels, which suggest two mutual contradictory inferences in regard to the scene of our Lord's manifestations. And first for S. Matthew.

The one chief feature of the Forty Days to which this Evangelist draws his readers' attention, is our Lord's great manifestation in Galilee. Even in the preceding chapters he is careful to narrate (xxvi. 32) our Lord's prophecy of that manifestation: a prophecy recorded neither by S. Luke nor S. John. The only message to the Apostles, which he mentions as sent through the holy women, is: "Go quickly and tell His disciples that He has risen, and lo He goeth before you into Galilee: *there ye shall see Him*" (xxviii. 7). When He appears to the holy women, His one message is the same: "Go charge my brethren that they go to Galilee: *there they shall see Me*" (verse 10). And immediately afterwards—so soon as he has despatched the little episode about the guard and the Jewish priest (verses 11—15)—S. Matthew thus proceeds: "But the eleven disciples went to Galilee to the mountain where Jesus had appointed [to meet them], and seeing they worshipped Him" (verses 16, 17). Then, with a brief account of what our Lord said to them on that occasion, he terminates his Gospel. We think it cannot fairly be denied, that persons who knew nothing of the matter except what they learned from S. Matthew, would take for granted that our Lord did not appear to His Apostles, except only in Galilee; or (at the very least) that He did not appear to them in

Jerusalem, at any time previous to the Galilean manifestation.

There is one reply indeed to such a statement, which will at once be in the mouth of many Christians. The very same peculiarities, it will be said, are to a great extent found in S. Mark's Gospel. He also is careful (xiv. 28) to narrate our Lord's prophecy of the Galilean manifestation; and he also (xvi. 7) recounts no other message as sent to the Apostles, except that "He goes before you into Galilee; there ye shall see Him as He said." And yet, it will be added, this same S. Mark at once proceeds to mention various appearances of our Lord, *not one of which took place in Galilee* (vv. 9—20). Catholics will reasonably lay much stress on this reply. If it does not follow in S. Mark's case, from the language which he records about Galilee, that he was ignorant of our Lord's appearances in Jerusalem,—neither does this necessarily follow in S. Matthew's case. But there are many pious Christians, Mr. Hutton being in their number, to whom this argument is not available; for these persons deny the genuineness of S. Mark's concluding verses. A Catholic (we consider) is protected by the Church's authority from any such denial; but Christians who do not accept that authority are much divided in opinion. A few years ago Dean Burgon, an Anglican divine of great ability and erudition, put forth a detailed argument on the orthodox side. Dr. Morison, a very learned and (we may add) very lively and interesting Protestant commentator, says (Commentary on S. Mark, p. lxxv.), "There is really

not the shadow of a good reason for questioning the authenticity of the passage." But other excellent critics—as e. g. Mr. Hutton—speak very differently; and *they* therefore cannot found any argument on these verses.

So much then on S. Matthew. The primâ facie appearance of contradiction to him in S. Luke's account is certainly remarkable. S. Matthew writes, as though our Lord never appeared to His Apostles after the Resurrection, except in Galilee; S. Luke writes, as though the notion had never entered his (S. Luke's) mind, that the Risen Lord appeared in Galilee at all. In his narrative, the angels who address the holy women (xxiv. 5—7) do not refer ever so distantly to any such future appearance. They recall to their hearers' memory—not (as in S. Matthew) what our Lord had said concerning His future manifestation in Galilee,—but merely what He had said about His future Resurrection. S. Luke next narrates (verses 13—32) the conversation which passed on Easter Day between Jesus and the two going to Emmaus; he then mentions incidentally (verse 34) an appearance to S. Peter as having taken place the same day; and proceeds (verses 36 et seq.) to narrate the interview of that evening, between our Blessed Lord and His Apostles. Lastly S. Luke's words at first sight give the impression (see verses 50, 51) that, at the conclusion of that interview, He straightway led them out to Bethany and ascended to heaven in their sight.

We have stated, with the fullest force in our power,

what is by far the most important of those alleged discrepancies, on which infidels lay stress. Now in what way does the believer *account* for these various appearances, greater or smaller, of discrepancy and contradiction? He accounts for them (as we have already said) by certain characteristics of composition, which thoughtful students have observed in the Gospels. These make no pretensions to be *histories:* they are four distinct collections of sacred memoirs or anecdotes. Then the principle, on which each Evangelist has put together his own collection, is not (if one may so speak) a historical, but a religious and doctrinal principle.* From the first it has been a matter of pious interest among Christians, to detect the more or less subtle train of thought, which is (as one may say) the principle of unity in each Gospel. Moreover—what is especially here to be considered—not only this principle of unity is in no sense historical, but each Evangelist, while pursuing his own plan, shows himself quite indifferent to the question, whether his language taken by itself might not lead to serious historical misapprehension.

We will give one instance of what we here intend, and several others might easily be added. Thus every

* "If we compare any series of incidents which they contain with a similar series in any historian ancient or modern, we shall find at once that, apart from all other differences, there is a fundamental distinction in the way in which the incidents are put together. In the one the circumstances of time and place rule the connection; in the other the spiritual import, not independent of these but yet rising above them, is distinctly predominant."—Westcott on the Gospels, p. 349.

reader of the three Synoptical Gospels, whose knowledge is limited by what they say, would take for granted, that the scene of our Lord's public ministry lay entirely in Galilee, until the very time when He journeyed to Jerusalem for his Passion. See e. g. Matt. xx. 17, et seq.; Mark x. 32, et seq.; Luke ix. 51, et seq. Any exclusive reader of the Synoptists would be quite as startled at hearing of those frequent visits to Jerusalem which S. John records,—as an exclusive reader of S. Matthew could be, at hearing of the Jerusalem post-Resurrection manifestations narrated by S. Luke. Yet every Christian student must admit that, beyond all possibility of question, both S. Matthew and S. Luke were well aware of these visits to Jerusalem. They showed this, we say, beyond all possibility of question, by recording His language of affection towards the holy city. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, *how often* have I desired to gather thy children as the hen gathers her chickens under her wings, and *ye would not*" (Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34). Nothing can more clearly illustrate the peculiar method of composition adopted by the Evangelists.

It is further observable that, in their narratives of the Resurrection just as in our preceding illustration, both S. Matthew and S. Luke, when duly examined, give indication that they do *not* necessarily intend what primâ facie they seem to imply. We begin with S. Matthew. In his narrative the Angel says to the holy women "lo He goeth before you into Galilee: *there shall ye see Him.*" The obvious and natural

inference from this statement would undoubtedly be, that the place appointed for His appearance to them was not Jerusalem, but exclusively Galilee. And yet in the very next verse the Evangelist proceeds to relate their seeing Him in Jerusalem. S. Matthew, we see, did not regard the angelic announcement of a great and comprehensive Galilean manifestation, as incompatible with a preliminary appearance to the holy women in Jerusalem. Neither therefore need he have regarded that announcement, as incompatible with preliminary appearances to the *Apostles* in Jerusalem. Even apart then from any comparison with the other Evangelists, S. Matthew's own statements suffice to show the Christian student, that it is most precarious to draw any inference from the primâ facie appearance of his general drift.

The same remark may be made on S. Luke. The general current and texture of his narrative would lead his readers to suppose, that our Lord ascended into heaven on the very evening of the Resurrection. Yet, without consulting the other Evangelists, a more careful examination of S. Luke's own statements would dispose the Christian inquirer to reject such a supposition. First consider his order of facts. The day was far spent (verse 29) when Jesus was with the two disciples at Emmaus. After He left them, they returned the whole way to Jerusalem, and were probably some time with the Apostles ere He joined them. Some time passed in convincing them of His actual Resurrection, and in discoursing to them. It would therefore—on the supposition which we are

opposing—have probably been late in the evening, ere He led them out to Bethany, two miles distant; and the Ascension itself would probably have been at dead of night.* S. Luke certainly cannot have intended this. We lay still more stress however on verse 45: "Then opened He their mind, that they should understand the Scriptures." No doubt this *may* mean, that then and there, by a sudden exercise of power, He infused into their mind a mass of supernatural knowledge. But our present question is,—not what the Evangelist *may* have meant—but what is his obvious and natural drift. And we say that the obvious and natural drift of this verse harmonizes entirely with what the same writer says in his other work. There he narrates that Jesus "appeared to them *during forty days*, and announced those things which concern the kingdom of God" (Acts i. 3); thus *gradually* "opening their mind, that they should understand the Scriptures." But now, if S. Luke did not mean to imply in his Gospel that our Lord ascended on Easter Day, his narrative does not *otherwise* discredit the fact, that various manifestations of the Forty Days took place in Galilee. For Mr. Hutton's argument, derived from ver. 49, assumes that the words in question were spoken on Easter Day; and has absolutely no meaning, if they be dated forty days later, after the Galilean manifestations had taken place.

Now in regard to the Gospels, a certain very marked peculiarity of composition was perhaps in some sense to be expected. It was in some sense perhaps to be

* See Andrews's "Life of Our Lord," p. 528.

expected by a Catholic that, as their theme is absolutely unique in comparison with that of all other books whatever, inspired or uninspired—for what they contain is nothing less than the Holy Ghost's own record of the human acts and words of Almighty God—so their method of composition also should be absolutely unique. At all events the facts are what they are; and what they exhibit is this. Each Evangelist is intent on simply narrating certain words and acts of our Lord, which are relevant to the doctrinal purpose at which he (the Evangelist) aims, or which tend to produce that particular kind of religious impression which he desires. But as to *theorizing* on those acts and words, or harmonizing them, or setting forth systematically their significance and drift—such an attempt is quite external to his method of composition. There may be a thousand reasons—some indeed are easily imaginable—why the Holy Ghost should thus limit the scope of those, who were intrusted with what in some sense may be called the most sacred commission ever assigned to men. It may well be e.g. that the dignity of their office is better consulted, by their being inspired to content themselves with words of simple and solemn narration; and to leave comment or explanation in the hand of other writers—inspired or uninspired—whose place of dignity as writers is below theirs. But considerations of this kind are of course conjectural, and altogether superfluous to the necessities of our argument. At last the Gospels were *inspired:* and we need hardly add, that the Holy Spirit "bloweth where He willeth, and

thou hearest His voice; but thou knowest not whence He cometh and whither He goeth."

But the more influential infidels are in general so impetuously and recklessly illogical, that they will in all probability (if they happen to light on our remarks) accuse us of here begging the question. We are purporting—such will be their objection—to reason for the trustworthiness of the Gospels; and we are assuming their inspiration as part of our premisses. But such a reply (we say) is intensely illogical. We are not here maintaining that intrinsic reasoning *proves* the trustworthiness of the Gospels; but only that it does not *dis*prove that trustworthiness. Now if the existence of A is alleged as disproving the existence of B,—such an objection (according to the laws of logic) is entirely overthrown, when it is shown that, by assuming the existence of C, the co-existence of A and B is easily explained. Such is the case here. Certain facts are alleged—certain particulars of the Gospel narrative—as disproving the trustworthiness of the Gospels. Our reply is, that,—if the inspiration of the Gospels be assumed,—on the one hand they are certainly trustworthy, while on the other hand there is no difficulty in explaining the alleged facts. If the Gospels be inspired, there is no difficulty whatever in supposing that they have a method of composition specially their own. And if it be admitted that they have a method of composition specially their own, there is no difficulty whatever in harmonizing those alleged discrepancies, on which the infidel insists. Those alleged discrepancies therefore cannot be ad-

duced as disproving the inspiration of the Gospels,—still less as disproving their general trustworthiness—unless the fundamental laws of logic are set at defiance.

What we affirm then is, that there is no real difficulty whatever in harmonizing the Gospel narratives of the Resurrection and understanding the drift of the respective Evangelists, if it be assumed that their method of composition is such as we have described. The rest of our remarks will be occupied with setting this forth in detail.

III.

There are two totally different purposes (to mention no others), which were plainly intended by our Lord's manifestations after His Resurrection: and S. Matthew bears in mind throughout one of these purposes, while S. Luke bears in mind the other. The first was, that our Lord should solemnly appear before the assembled Church,—authenticate Himself (so to speak) as Risen,—and inaugurate His Kingdom by pronouncing the Apostolical commission in the presence of the congregated faithful. Now such an appearance could not possibly take place in Jerusalem, without revolutionizing God's providential arrangement, concerning the non-publicity of our Lord's appearances after His Resurrection.* The solemn manifestation therefore of which we speak was necessarily fixed in Galilee. The peculiar importance which our Lord attached to

* "Him God raised on the third day, and manifested, *not to all the people*, but to witnesses preordained by God" (Acts x. 41).

it is shown by the circumstance, that, of all the recorded appearances, it is the only one, which took place *by previous arrangement.* To narrate this manifestation in itself and in its relevant circumstances—was emphatically to exhibit what has been called "the majesty of the triumphant Messias"; and this was a task peculiarly congenial to S. Matthew, whose one salient and universally admitted characteristic is the setting forth Christ's regal dignity. Accordingly he places in clear light everything which bears on this manifestation. He takes care to record our Lord's promise before His death, that He will not suffer His flock to be dispersed, but will guide it in due time into Galilee.* In his last chapter S. Matthew narrates a portion of the means taken, for keeping alive among the body of disciples a general sense of expectancy, in reference to this great Galilean manifestation. It was with this view that the Angel was commissioned to tell the holy women at once—recalling the earlier prophecy—"He leads you forth into Galilee, there ye shall see Him." And for the same purpose, at a later period of the day, our Lord Himself said to them: "Go charge My brethren that they go to Galilee: there they shall see Me."

To all this it may be objected, that at last it is only

* "For it is written, 'I will smite the Shepherd and the sheep of the flock shall be dispersed'; but, after I have risen, I will go before you into Galilee" (xxvi. 31, 2). The "go before" does not of course mean that He will be in Galilee before they are: the reference is to the pastoral office, mentioned in the preceding verse. See John x. 4.

"the Eleven" who are mentioned by S. Matthew as having gone to see Him in Galilee. But even if we interpret S. Matthew exclusively by his own text, it is quite certain that he does not limit this manifestation to the Eleven. The holy women (verse 7) are expressly told, that *they* at all events are to see the Lord in Galilee. But in truth the verse imports more than this. "Go tell *His disciples* that He has risen and leads you forth to Galilee: there *ye* shall see Him." The "ye" necessarily means "ye *disciples*." Nor can the word possibly be limited to the *Eleven*, because most indubitably it includes the holy women themselves; and it refers therefore to all those who were disciples in the most general sense. Moreover (verse 10) all His "brethren" are to be included in the privilege; and who will dare to suggest, that those disciples who were not Apostles were here excluded by Him from the name of "brethren"? Again the words, "where Jesus had appointed them," naturally point to a large meeting, for the accomplishment of which previous appointment and concert would be necessary. But in truth the universality of this meeting is implied by S. Matthew from beginning to end. The key-note of his whole narrative is sounded in xxvi. 31, 2. "The Shepherd shall be struck and the flock dispersed; but I the Shepherd, after I have risen from the dead, will pastorally reunite the flock in Galilee." The Angel (xxviii. 6, 7) reminds the holy women of this special prophecy; and can intend therefore nothing less, than to announce and enjoin a reunion in Galilee of the whole Christian flock.

Nor is it at all difficult to understand, why the Eleven should be specially mentioned in verse 16. The flock were not to visit Galilee promiscuously and individually, but under the guidance of those who supplied the place of their Shepherd. "The Eleven went to Galilee," in charge of, and accompanied by, the "brethren." Take an obvious secular illustration. Certain allied powers are engaged in a widely-diffused continental war. At a certain period however, the generalissimo calls on the dispersed army to meet at some given rendezvous. At once "all the generals resorted to this rendezvous." No one would understand by this expression, that the generals arrived as so many units: every one would understand it to mean, that they arrived at the head of their respective troops.

And this explanation supplies the only altogether natural interpretation of the words in verse 17—"but some doubted"—which have often been felt as a difficulty. "Οἱ ἕνδεκα . . . ἰδόντες αὐτὸν προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ, οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν." If the words referred to the Apostles, their more natural meaning would be, that "the Apostles in general worshipped him, but some *of them* doubted"; and S. Matthew would thus be brought into virtual collision with S. Luke and S. John. But we submit that, even as a matter of verbal criticism, such a rendering cannot be defended. We submit that where this form of expression is used, the principal subject is always a kind of *crowd;* certainly many more than eleven. See e.g. Matt. xxvi. 67: "ἐνέπτυσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκολάφισαν

αὐτόν· οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν."* According to our suggestion, the two verses may be thus paraphrased :—"The Eleven, and all the brethren under their guidance, went to Galilee: and when Jesus appeared, the mass of the brethren worshipped Him; but some of them momentarily doubted."†

In fact almost all Christian commentators have been driven, by the very necessity of the case, to identify this manifestation on the Galilean mountain with the appearance to "more than five hundred brethren at once" recorded by S. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 6). Such a meeting (as we have already pointed out) could not possibly have taken place in Jerusalem. Moreover, as Greswell truly argues, "five hundred brethren could never have been present at the same time and place, except by appointment"; and no other manifestation but this is mentioned in the Gospels, as having been *made* by appointment. It was before the assembled five hundred then, that Jesus said to the Eleven, "Go ye and teach all nations," for "lo I am with you all days even to the end of the world." And S. Matthew, by thus concluding his Gospel, emphatically corroborates what we have said, as to the special purpose which he kept before his mind in his whole treatment of the Resurrection. All three Synoptists conclude, in one shape or other, with our Lord's pronouncement of the Apostolic commission. But whereas that pro-

* Alford quotes from Xenophon : "*ᾤχοντο εἰς Δεκέλειαν, οἱ δ' εἰς Μέγαρα.*"

† We do not understand this "doubt" to have continued, after they had gazed upon Him more closely and heard His voice.

nouncement was uttered on two different occasions, S. Matthew characteristically chooses that which was made in the face of the whole Church. We may add, that he himself implies the fragmentariness of his narrative, by neither mentioning an ascension nor any other termination of our Lord's earthly ministry. And when we consider that those who saw Jesus on the mountain were more than five hundred,—while those who saw Him otherwise did not at the utmost amount to thirty,—we can well understand why the other manifestations, from his stand-point, appeared to S. Matthew of little account.

IV.

The other great end, to which our Risen Lord's appearances were directed, was His training of the Apostles for their great work, and His final preparation of them for the coming of the Holy Ghost. For this end, three things (to mention no others) were important. Firstly, that they should enable themselves, by repeated interviews with Him, to testify to the world with indubitable authority that He had risen indeed. Secondly it was important that—in regard to His Death and Resurrection—they should understand the deep harmony which exists, between these two central verities on one hand, and the antecedent testimony both of the Old Testament and of our Lord Himself on the other. Thirdly it was important, that those great truths concerning "the Kingdom of God"

(Acts i. 3), which the Apostles "could not bear" (John xvi. 12) during His earlier ministry, should be set forth by His oral teaching, before the Holy Ghost came to place the whole of that teaching in an unspeakably clearer and fuller light.* It was moreover included in God's counsels, that at that period a certain power of remitting sins should be conferred on the Apostles, the precise nature of which this is not the place to investigate.

Of these four particulars, it is the first and second which S. Luke especially bears in mind, throughout the last chapter of his Gospel: and it is plain at once that the great Galilean manifestation had no bearing on them at all. Thus what is it in his narrative, which the Angels say to the holy women? "He has risen: *remember how He spoke to you*, &c."† Then, when conferring with the two disciples on their road to Emmaus, "He began with Moses and the Prophets, and interpreted to them those things which were written concerning Himself in all the Scripture" (verse 27). Later in the day He refers the Eleven to the predictions He had made before His death, as

* "He shall not speak of Himself. . . . He shall receive from Mine and declare to you."—John xvi. 13, 14.

† We must not for a moment be understood as thinking, that the Angels did not *in fact* on this occasion—just as on the occasion narrated by S. Matthew—declare to those holy women our Lord's approaching manifestation in Galilee. It is plain to our mind, from the whole drift of S. Matthew's last chapter, that they must have done so. S. Luke in no way implies that he has recorded *the whole* of what they said. He records what bears on his own purpose.

well as to the utterances of the Scriptures (verse 44). And as regards the *first* particular we recited—His giving them means of testifying with absolute authority that He had truly risen—observe verses 31, 2; verse 39; verses 42, 3.

We have already said that (to our mind) by far the more obvious interpretation of verse 45—"then He opened their mind that they should understand the Scripture"—is to take it as implying a continuous course of instruction. We would thus paraphrase verses 45, 6:—"At that time He began a course of instruction, on the references to Himself in the Old Testament; an instruction continued by Him at intervals when He visited them during the Forty Days. Then in His final interview—on Ascension Day itself—He summed up His lessons, that He might leave them deeply impressed on their memory, saying '*thus* it was written in Scripture, &c.'"

We will now consider the other two Evangelists; commencing with S. John. It will be found in his case that,—so far from any difficulties being presented by his narrative—it corroborates in various ways what we have been saying. It is plain on the surface to a Christian reader, that he writes throughout his Gospel as supplementing the Synoptists, especially S. Luke; and as thereby endorsing their substantial accuracy. It has been observed indeed more than once in this REVIEW,* that almost the whole of S. John might be inserted in large sections between various breaks in

* [See p. 312 of this volume.]

the third Gospel, and a continuous history be thus made up of the two. In no part of S. John's Gospel is his reference to his predecessors more conspicuous, than in his 20th chapter; and Hengstenberg for one is to our mind very successful in pointing out this fact.

Thus in verse 1 S. John says that "Mary Magdalene cometh very early, and seeth *the* stone (*τὸν λίθον*) removed from the sepulchre." But S. John had not himself spoken of *any* stone, in connection with the sepulchre.

Then, whereas it might have been fancied from verse 1 that S. John regarded S. Mary Magdalene as having gone *by herself* to the sepulchre, this supposition is negatived by verse 2: "they have taken away the Lord, and *we* know not where they have laid him." Plainly he intended his readers to understand his verse 1 by the light of the earlier Evangelists.

We next come to his account of S. Peter's and his own visit to the sepulchre. S. Luke had only said that "Peter rose and went to the sepulchre," &c. (xxiv. 12); but S. John explains (verses 3—10) that he had himself accompanied S. Peter on this occasion. And there is an obvious harmony between the two accounts: compare e.g. the "*ἀπῆλθε πρὸς ἑαυτὸν*" of Luke xxiv. 12, with the "*ἀπῆλθον πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς*" of John xx. 10. But it is further remarkable, that S. Luke himself was indubitably aware of S. Peter not having been alone in his visit. For (verse 24) he represents the two disciples as saying: "*certain of our brethren* went to the sepulchre, and found

things to be as the women said, but Him they found not."

We proceed to our Lord's appearance among the Apostles, on the evening of Easter Day. In his account of this, S. John rapidly summarizes what has already been said by S. Luke, adding in their appropriate place supplementary details of his own. Thus S. Luke says: "they were frightened and thought they saw a spirit" (verse 37). *Why* should they think this? Because "the doors were shut" (John xx. 19), and He entered without their being opened. A parallel incident is mentioned in Matt. xiv. 26: "When they saw Him walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying, It is a spirit"; because He seemed above the laws of a material body. Again S. Luke had said (verse 40) that "He showed them His hands and feet": and S. John adds (verse 20) that He also showed them His side; a supplement especially appropriate in him, who alone had mentioned the *wound* in the side (xix. 34). Lastly S. John adds, what S. Luke had omitted, that on this occasion the Apostles received a certain power of remitting sins.

An objection has been made, that S. Luke (verse 33) mentions "the Eleven" as present on this occasion, whereas it is seen from S. John that only ten of the Apostles were there. But it is really quite an obvious supposition, that during these Forty Days "the Eleven" was as it were an official name for "the Apostles." So in 1 Cor. xv. 5—according to the reading of the "textus receptus," the reading followed by S. Chrysostom—S. Paul says that our Lord, after

appearing to S. Peter, "appeared to *the Twelve.*" Certainly S. Paul did not include Judas Iscariot; and he must have said "the Twelve" therefore, as meaning "the Apostles."* In like manner—as Alford suggests—the Romans of a certain period would naturally have spoken of appearing before the "decemviri," without at all meaning to imply that all ten had been present.†

S. John next proceeds to mention S. Thomas's absence on this occasion, in order that he may more intelligibly describe the manifestation on Low Sunday which the Synoptists had omitted.

We may also draw attention to the similarity between John xx. 30 and Acts i. 3, as indicating the *frequency* of our Lord's appearances: "Multa alia signa fecit Jesus in conspectu discipulorum." For the reasons given by Maldonatus, we think that these "signa" were manifestations after the Resurrection.

Lastly, though he does not narrate the Ascension which had already been recorded by SS. Mark and Luke, S. John emphatically confirms the testimony

* The Vulgate reading is "Undecim." We believe however that the great preponderance of authority is for the reading of the "textus receptus." Moreover it is indefinitely easier to understand how some copyist should have been induced to substitute "eleven" for "twelve," than how he should have been induced to make the opposite substitution.

† Luke xxiv. 33, "the Eleven and *those who were with them.*" Who were these latter? Alford appositely refers to Acts i. 14. We may infer with much probability that "those who were with," —i.e. who lived with—"the Eleven," were the devout women and the "brethren"—i.e. the kinsmen—of our Lord.

borne by them to that fact, by mentioning our Lord's words to S. Mary Magdalene (xx. 17): "I ascend to My Father and your Father, My God and your God."

S. John's twentieth chapter then—not only presents no additional difficulty—but in fact greatly confirms the appearance of truthfulness presented by S. Matthew and S. Luke. We may add, that S. John's narrative as a whole corroborates what we have said, on the perfect consistency between these two earlier Evangelists. In his twentieth chapter he is as profoundly silent as S. Luke himself, in regard to any hint or suggestion that our Lord appeared in Galilee; and yet in his twenty-first chapter he relates a remarkable manifestation as having there taken place. It may be well to add that, though many Protestants do not consider this chapter to have been contained in his original Gospel, yet we believe that almost all, who admit the rest to be genuine, accept the genuineness of this chapter. Several of them indeed think that S. John added it at a later period by way of appendix; but for that matter we do not know why any Catholic may not regard this as a probable opinion.

A difficulty has been derived from the twenty-first chapter, in consequence of S. John saying (ver. 14): "this is *the third* time on which Jesus manifested Himself to His disciples, after He had risen from the dead." If these words however were understood to mean that this was only the third time Jesus had appeared to *any disciple*, S. John would be brought into conflict, not with the Synoptists only, but with himself; as in his twentieth chapter he has mentioned

three appearances (verses 14, 19, 26). It is very easy however to take the verse as meaning, that this was the third time, on which Jesus appeared before a collected number of Apostles sufficient to represent the whole body. This is in full accordance with S. John's own narrative; and it is equally in accordance with the narrative of all three Synoptists.

Now as to S. Mark's concluding chapter. And first it may be thought on the surface a difficulty, that—whereas he narrates (xiv. 28) our Lord's declaration that He would appear in Galilee, and reiterates (xvi. 6) the Angel's announcement of that appearance, —yet he does not describe that appearance as taking place. But so far from this circumstance discrediting the truth of the Galilean manifestation, it does just the contrary. By the very fact of reciting the angel's announcement, S. Mark implies that the thing announced took place. And just as S. John mentions our Lord's prophecy of His Ascension, but does not narrate the Ascension itself;—so, most intelligibly, S. Mark, having *implied* that a great Galilean manifestation took place, did not think it necessary to include that manifestation, in his very brief summary from verse 9 to verse 14.

Another objection has been raised, because S. Mark says (verse 8) that the holy women "told no one anything" of what they had seen and heard, "for they were afraid": whereas both in S. Matthew and S. Luke, they at once bring full intelligence to the Apostles. Alford pronounces (ad locum) that "all attempts to reconcile this with the other Gospels are

futile"; but to us such reconcilement seems easy and even obvious. It was in some sense their more natural course that, as soon as they had received the angelic message, they should at once publicly blazon the fact, so as to cover those with shame who had "crucified the Just One." But "fear" restrained them from this; and they hurried to place themselves under the protection of the Apostles, before they did anything else. On the other hand, it is simply absurd to suppose that "fear" would prevent them from speaking to the Apostles. *What* had they to fear in doing so?

It is further alleged, that S. Mark differs importantly from S. Luke, on the state of mind to which the Apostles were brought on hearing of the Resurrection. S. Luke, it is said, represents them as believing and joyful; whereas S. Mark represents them as unbelieving, and as rebuked by our Lord on that very account. But look at S. Luke's own account of their demeanour, when our Lord appeared on the evening of Easter Day; even though they had heard of His Resurrection, both from the two disciples and from S. Peter himself. They were "disturbed and frightened, thinking they saw a spirit" (verse 37); for very "joy, they believed not and remained in wonder" (verse 41). No other divergency between S. Mark and S. Luke can be maintained, except that, whereas belief and unbelief were mutually struggling in the Apostles' mind, S. Luke lays more stress on the belief, and S. Mark on the unbelief. "The tide of thought and feeling," as has been well said, was in

those early moments "surging and resurging in contrary directions." Nor is there anything, either in the letter or spirit of S. Luke's account, which has the remotest appearance of inconsistency with the supposition, that our Lord may have said a little more in the way of loving rebuke and tender remonstrance, than S. Luke has expressly stated.

Lastly, it is objected that S. Mark represents our Lord to have ascended on the evening of Easter Day. There is no appearance of ground however for this suggestion, except the word "novissimè" in verse 14; which is plainly a mistranslation. "Ὑστερον" simply means "afterwards." S. Mark is briefly summarizing some chief appearances of Jesus Risen, before he recounts at greater length the final appearance on Ascension Day. He appeared first to Magdalene (verse 9); then to the two going to Emmaus (verse 12); then to the Eleven (ver. 14). These and other appearances were closed by a final address (verses 15—18), after uttering which He ascended into heaven. These were His last words on earth, and they are given by S. Mark alone. Immediately after uttering them, "He was taken up into heaven," where He "sitteth at the right hand of God" (ver. 19). On the other hand—if (as is held by all Catholics and by many others), the last verses of this Gospel really proceed from the second Evangelist—it is simply impossible that he can have supposed our Lord to have ascended on Easter Day; because (verse 27) he narrates the angelic announcement, that His disciples were to see

Him in Galilee. And this fact throws light in its turn on S. Luke's elliptical language in xxiv. 46.

V.

We now proceed to sum up these various considerations, by exhibiting the Gospel narrative of the Resurrection in its combined features. We assume that, in the intervals between His various appearances, Jesus abode with His Blessed Mother. We spoke of this in April, 1867,* and our general summary is such as the following.

Shortly before sunrise on the Third Day, our Lord rose from the dead, and betook Himself to His Blessed Mother. Meanwhile two different companies of holy women were on their way, with a view of completing (as one may say) His funeral solemnities. "He had predicted," says Greswell "only six days before, that the unction of His body by Mary, the sister of Lazarus, would be the sole embalmment which" His Body "should receive from the grave. The mixture brought by Nicodemus had perhaps not been duly prepared: and was certainly not duly applied; for it was not the customary method of embalming a body merely to wrap up aromatics or spices along with it in the graveclothes." The holy women most characteristically were eager to supply every deficiency; but the intervention of the Sabbath obliged them to defer

* [See p. 214 of this volume.]

their labour of love until the Sunday. The first of the two companies, on arriving within sight of the sepulchre, perceived that the stone had been removed from its entrance; and S. Mary Magdalene, one of their number, at once ran back to SS. Peter and John, that she might announce this startling fact. Her companions proceeded to the sepulchre; and, learning from an angel that Jesus had risen, returned rapidly to the disciples with this intelligence. Soon afterwards another body of women arrived, received a similar angelic announcement, and likewise departed. The main burden of their message was, that Jesus had truly risen according to His promise, and that Galilee was the place where all should see Him. Meanwhile SS. Peter and John, on hearing only a small part of this astounding information, ran to the sepulchre; and there convinced themselves, not only that the stone was indeed rolled away, but that the Body itself was most certainly removed. S. John at once believed that He had risen: of S. Peter we know no more, than that he returned wondering what could have taken place.

To the great body of disciples however—as might have been expected—the tidings brought by the holy women appeared but as idle tales. And even if our Blessed Lord had had no other purpose in manifesting Himself after His Resurrection, except that borne specially in mind by S. Matthew,—viz. that He might authenticate Himself to all as Risen and give the Apostles their commission in the presence of the whole flock—even had this (we say) been His sole purpose,

it would have been necessary to make certain preliminary manifestations in Jerusalem. That large meeting (humanly speaking) could not be brought about, unless the Apostles and general body of disciples were first convinced of His Resurrection. He appeared accordingly to S. Mary Magdalene; and soon afterwards to the other holy women: then to the two on their way to Emmaus: then to S. Peter: then to ten of the Apostles, and "those who were with them."

These appearances must have given rise to indefinite variety and fluctuation of opinion, among those disciples who had not seen Him. It is not merely that one man would have thought this and another that,—but that the same man would at one moment think this and at another that, according to the circumstances of the moment; according to the fluctuations of his temperament, or the influence of the last speaker. S. Thomas no doubt represented a considerable proportion of those who, in S. Luke's words (xxiv. 41), "disbelieved for" very "joy." If S. Thomas's incredulity were removed, the incredulity of the rest would for the most part vanish also: and this was accordingly effected by that manifestation of the following Sunday, which elicited from S. Thomas the acknowledgment "My Lord and my God." Meanwhile what words can describe—what thoughts imagine—the treasures of heavenly knowledge, with which our Lord enriched His Blessed Mother, during the six intervening days of their holy and uninterrupted communion?

At the last Apostolic interview the command was

doubtless given, that the whole flock should now return to Galilee, under guidance of the Apostles: for this command was the very pastoral "going before them into Galilee," which had been predicted both before and after the Resurrection. There almost immediately He showed Himself (John xxi.) to seven of the Apostles; and on that occasion doubtless fixed time and place, for the great manifestation to the five hundred which very speedily followed. The Apostles publicly received their commission in presence of the whole Church; and from that time there began a new series of manifestations to them (Acts i. 3), training them to the fulfilment of that commission. Under ordinary circumstances they would have remained in Galilee, until the time of departure for the Pentecostal Feast: but though the general body of disciples did so remain, the Apostles, by our Lord's command, returned ten days earlier to Jerusalem, that they might fulfil an essential part of their office by witnessing His Ascension. It may be that this command was conveyed to the rest through S. James; and that this was the appearance to that Apostle recorded by S. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 7). The whole number of Christians at that time in Jerusalem was not less than 120 (Acts i. 15): but these no doubt chiefly consisted of Jerusalem converts, who went indeed to Galilee for the great manifestation, but probably returned at once to their native city. The Ascension apparently took place in the presence of none but the Apostles;*

* We do not here venture to speculate on the relation in which

who immediately before had received their parting injunction, and had been charged to remain at Jerusalem, in constant mutual communion, for the ten days which should intervene before the coming of the Holy Ghost.

This certainly seems to us a straightforward and intelligible narrative: while it is in entire harmony both with the express statements and with the entire spirit of the Four Gospels. But we must not fail to take a further step. There are certain minor and subordinate mutual discrepancies, which have been alleged as discoverable in the fourfold narrative of the Resurrection: discrepancies, which would not in any way disparage the thorough general trustworthiness of the Evangelists, but which would be inconsistent with the full doctrine of Scriptural inspiration. These discrepancies refer exclusively to the incidents of Easter Day itself. It would be intolerably tedious to consider them all, one by one; but we will treat those particulars which have been most prominently urged.

(1.) Protestant harmonists have been much perplexed by Matt. xxviii. 9: which runs in the Anglican version, "*But as* [the holy women] *were on their way to the disciples,* Jesus met them," &c. The words in italics have never been in the Vulgate; and the best Protestant commentators now agree that they are spurious. They would certainly introduce into the narrative a difficulty quite different in kind from any which now exists. Moreover (as has been pointed out by an

our Blessed Lady may have stood to the circumstances of the Ascension.

Anglican commentator) the intrinsic evidence of the verse itself is against them; for if the holy women had actually been hastening to the Apostles at the very moment when Jesus encountered them, He would hardly have said "*Go* tell my brethren," &c. As the text really stands, S. Matthew,—having mentioned that the holy women at once ran to the disciples,—adds: "and behold Jesus met them saying 'hail.'" Now every student of S. Matthew well knows, that his "καὶ ἰδοὺ" (as Greswell says) "is his usual formulary of transition, when he would pass from one memorable particular to another, without affirming anything of the relative order between them." It was plainly no part of his design, to exhibit the gradual growth of the disciples from infidelity to belief. And there was no reason therefore for his explaining, that the manifestation mentioned at verse 9 did not occur at the first departure of the holy women from the sepulchre, but under other perhaps somewhat similar circumstances. For according to that view of facts which to us seems the more probable, what took place was something of this kind. The announcement, first made by the holy women, was viewed by the general Christian body with entire incredulity; and from this an obvious result would ensue. Knowing how certain were the things they had seen, they would seek solace for the moment exclusively in each other's company; and they would retrace their steps towards the sepulchre, in hope of further intelligence and illumination. There they would meet S. Mary Magdalene; and hearing from her that she had actually seen

Jesus, they would listen with rapt attention to her detailed account of what had taken place. And while she and they were thus communing, "behold Jesus met them, &c." There was not in this case, as in so many others, an initial stage of unbelief or doubt; because (on our hypothesis) they were prepared for His appearance by what they had already heard. And in prompt obedience, they doubtless proceeded to the Apostles at once with their new announcement. Such announcement however was not generally known, until the two disciples had started for Emmaus. See Luke xxiv. 22.

(2.) Mark xvi. 2, runs thus: "Very early in the morning, *the sun having now risen*, they came to the sepulchre"; whereas S. Matthew says (xxviii. 1) "the day *was beginning to dawn*," and S. John (xx. 1) "*while it was yet dark.*" But S. Mark explains unmistakably the meaning of his own expression; for he says it was "very early" (*λίαν πρωΐ*). No one would characterize that period which we call sunrise as "*λίαν πρωΐ.*" Even S. John, when speaking of it as yet dark, does not say "*λίαν πρωΐ*," but only "*πρωΐ.*" Moreover S. Mark has the same phrase, "*λίαν πρωΐ*" in an earlier chapter (i. 35), where his meaning is entirely unmistakable. What he says then is this. The hour was extremely early; but not so early, that the sun had not begun to send forth its rays. "The sun is really risen," says Hengstenberg, "though its disc may not be visible, for the dawn is created by it." It was very early indeed (S. Mark); the darkness still predominated (S. John); but there was the first glimmering of dawn (S. Matthew), the

sun having begun to dispense its light (S. Mark again).*

(3.) As to the difference of angelic appearances, "we may venture to suppose," says Mr. Isaac Williams,—and no other supposition surely is consistent with common sense—"that countless angels were in ministry in and about our Saviour's tomb, and that one or more of them appeared to view as God gave command."

(4.) Luke xxiv. 10: "It was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and the other women that were with them, who told those things to the Apostles." These words, understood in their more obvious sense, would bring S. Luke into conflict with John xx. 1, 2. But there is no difficulty in so understanding S. Luke's words, as entirely to avoid this conflict. Ebrard puts this excellently: "A friend of mine is at the point of death, and I am just returning from a journey. In my way I am met in succession by different friends; one tells me of his illness, two others inform me of his death, and a fourth gives me a ring which he has bequeathed me. I hasten to the house and find a most mournful scene. On my return I write to a friend; and with the scene in the house most vivid in my mind, I write briefly of the rest; viz. that on my way home I met four friends, who told me of his illness and death, and handed me the ring." No one would call this statement inaccurate; and the inference is obvious. Tidings were brought to the Apostles by certain devout women, that our Lord's

* [Something more is said on this matter in the next Essay.]

Body had been removed from the sepulchre, and that Angels had announced His Resurrection. First of all, S. Mary Magdalene brought part of this intelligence to two of the Apostles; next Mary the mother of James and her company—lastly Joanna and her company—brought successive details to the other Apostles. S. Luke's mind was fixed on the great central fact, that the Apostles heard this astonishing intelligence from these holy women. In what order of time the women came in, and what particular detail was contributed by each,—this he did not care to mention; nor need we even suppose that he was inspired with precise knowledge of these minute particulars. It was literally true, that "they were Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, who told these things to the Apostles." Moreover it has been pointed out by a Protestant commentator, that the change of *tense* between verses 9 and 10 (ἀπήγγειλαν—ἔλεγον) is very significant. This change shows that verse 10 was by no means intended by S. Luke as merely a fuller explanation of verse 9.

It will be said perhaps, that we have throughout dealt largely in pure conjecture: but we reply, that this is precisely what our argument requires. To say that the Gospels are mutually discrepant, is to say that no chain of circumstances can possibly have happened, which is reconcilable with all four narratives. We reply that there are some ten hypotheses, more or less variant in detail, any one of which is reconcilable with the four narratives; and we have indicated that which to us appears the most probable. But to suggest an

hypothesis is, by the very force of terms, to express a conjecture.

VI.

We earnestly hope that various things contained in this article—over and above their immediate purpose—may not be without practical benefit to pious Christians. We earnestly hope that we may have suggested one or two considerations, which will assist them in more thoroughly mastering and realizing that unspeakably touching portion of the Gospels, which exhibits the acts and words of Jesus Risen. Our immediate polemical purpose however—as we have repeatedly said—has been entirely negative. We have supposed that certain truths, concerning the Resurrection and the Gospels, are otherwise established; and we have contended that the Gospels contain nothing in their final chapters, which presents any difficulty in the way of accepting those truths. Or we may put the same thing in a somewhat different shape. Various persons refuse to inquire into the extrinsic reasoning which purports to establish the Resurrection of Christ, and (again) the inspiration of Scripture; because they are so persuaded that the Gospel accounts of the Resurrection are in violent mutual contradiction. We have contended, that this persuasion has not the vestige of any reasonable foundation. And if this be so, then of course the extrinsic reasoning to which we refer has a claim to be accepted in its full legitimate

force, without any drawback from supposed intrinsic difficulties.

But we may reasonably take a further step of some importance. The Gospels—considered as to their intrinsic contents—are not purely negative elements in the controversy. On the contrary they add positive corroborative evidence of no small value, in behalf of the proposition, that Jesus truly rose from the dead. Infidels now commonly explain the Gospel narrative of the Resurrection by laying down, that Christians naturally came to accept, and by degrees enormously to exaggerate, what a few enthusiasts fancied themselves to have seen. But how remarkable it is, that these supposed exaggerations and fictions—discrepant though they be on the surface—are really in such deep mutual harmony as we have shown! Nor is this harmony confined to individual facts; but it extends to certain broad features of the narrative. Thus all the Evangelists agree, that the Resurrection was first announced to the holy women, and by them declared to the rest. Moreover (2) there is a profound concord among all the Evangelists, as to the kind of manifestations which our Lord vouchsafed after His Resurrection. He no longer habitually lived in the company of His disciples, but confined Himself to occasional and (except in one case) unexpected appearances; however frequent. Then (3) they seem to represent a certain change as having been wrought in His Sacred Countenance, which in one or two cases caused a momentary doubt of His identity. Further (4) any careful student of the four narratives will see,

that the demeanour of the Apostles to Him during the Forty Days is represented by all four Evangelists as differing most conspicuously from the familiarity of their approach—the readiness of their questioning and speech—before His death. And this circumstance has been very reasonably explained* as arising from the fact, that they apprehended and realized the truth of His Divine Personality, with indefinitely greater vividness than at the earlier period.

Now we would lay especial stress on this last feature of the narratives. The Evangelists never draw attention to it, or seem to reflect on it: yet one and all exhibit it. What can be more strange than to suppose, that the mere popular exaggeration of a few imagined facts would assume uniformly this very peculiar shape? In truth there are only two sufficient explanations of the phenomenon, which can even be imagined. One of these is, that the four narratives were invented by persons endowed with an exquisite sense of artistic fitness. The other is, that the narratives were not invented at all, but are a report of divers events which actually took place. Now the former supposition under circumstances is unspeakably absurd.

The comments, which we here bring to a close, are indubitably very fragmentary and imperfect. Nevertheless we hope they may have been found to throw some small degree of additional light on a portion of the Gospels, which for our own part we have always felt to possess a charm and attractiveness, quite specially its own.

* As e.g. by Dr. Northcote. [See the present volume, p. 213.]

F. COLERIDGE'S LIFE OF OUR LIFE.

The Life of our Life. By H. J. Coleridge, S.J. London: Burns & Oates.

The New Testament Narrative in the words of the Sacred Writers. Translated according to the Vulgate. London: Burns & Oates.

[April 1877.]

IT happens not unfrequently in the history of the world, that some work, eminently needing to be done, is placed (one may say) by the force of events, in the hands of some one eminently fitted to do it. We cannot but recognize something of this kind, as regards the circumstances which have engaged F. Coleridge in his labour of love on the Gospels. And in explaining why the work on which he is employed is to our mind one so eminently needed to be done—before we develop those considerations on which we should lay special stress—we will begin by mentioning one benefit derivable from it, which is subordinate indeed, but very far from unimportant.

I.

Those irreligious writers, who occupy so large a place in the speculative activity of this day, have two objects especially dear to them. They desire to dis-

credit the cognisableness of God, and (consistently with this aim) they desire to discredit the divine mission of Jesus Christ. In prosecuting the latter enterprise, their one principal weapon is to disparage in every possible way the trustworthiness of the Gospel narratives. We have argued on previous occasions that, even were the trustworthiness of the Gospels demonstrably disproved, such disproof would not even tend to impair the irrefragable proof which exists for the truth of our Lord's Resurrection. For irrefragable proof of that great verity may be derived from those Epistles of S. Paul which every infidel admits to be genuine, and from those historical facts which every infidel admits to be true. And there is no one whosoever, we suppose, who will admit the truth of our Lord's Resurrection, and at the same time doubt His divine mission. Still the Christian controversy against infidelity and misbelief is, in ways too numerous to recount, momentously reinforced, by placing in clear light the great authority reasonably claimed for the Gospels: claimed for them, we mean, even on historical or critical grounds, and apart from the Church's authority. Here then is one important service, rendered by such a writer as F. Coleridge. "The close acquaintance with each Evangelist separately" (he says, p. lix.) "which the study of Harmony requires, seems to me to produce an ever-increasing accumulation of proof of the extraordinary accuracy of the Gospels; as well of their very great nearness to the events of which they speak." By no other reply to infidel assaults on the

Gospel—numerous and powerful as such replies undoubtedly are—will the intellect and imagination of a sincere inquirer be so powerfully affected, as by the careful and conscientious study of such a work as that before us.

But it is not merely in the way of replying to objections, that this study will be so valuable. It has a much wider scope, as a prophylactic against modern misbelief:—

"The Gospels are the inheritance of the Christian people in all ages; but an intelligent acquaintance with them would be a specially powerful protection against the sophistries and illusions of our own time. From the highest forms of Protestantism down to the lowest phases of opinion, hardly to be called Christianity, from the objections which are raised under the name of science and history to the most unsubstantial of subjective dreamings, theological error as well as sentimental wilfulness, universalism and immorality, as well as sectarian obstinacy—all popular forms of falsehood and deception drop off into dust before the true knowledge of our Lord" (p. lx.).

II.

At last however such reasons as we have mentioned hold a comparatively subordinate place, among those which should stimulate every devout Christian who duly considers the case, to enter with keenest zest on a systematic study of the Gospels. Let it be once understood that they are the very acts and words of Almighty God which are therein placed before the believer for his meditation—and all other intellectual

studies shrink in some sense into comparative insignificance. God, by an act of mercy which might well have been thought incredible, has not only vouchsafed to clothe Himself in human nature and visit this earth, but to authenticate certain unspeakably precious records of what He did and said.* The only reasonable response to this mercy surely is, that all those who are capable of doing so should give a most prominent place in their intellectual life to a study of those records. Right-minded Christians, who are capable of such investigation, may or may not think it worth while to master profoundly and accurately this or that branch of secular history, ancient or modern: but there is one history at all events (one would think) on which they will eagerly lavish the richest resources of their intellect; viz. the human history of God the Son. Above every other series of facts which ever took place on this globe, they will labour to apprehend the full significance of all which He did and said; of all which others did and said to Him. They will strive to realize in detail every scene of which He was a part; to discover the thread which may connect one group of His words and acts with another; to understand the characteristic features exhibited by each successive period of His life. Those who hold as a dogma of the Faith that the Agent and Speaker of those acts and words is Almighty God, might be expected (one would think) to be separated from all

* We pointed out the distinction between these two separate mercies, in our review of F. Coleridge in July, 1875. [See pp. 343–346 of the present volume.]

others by no one more manifest and conspicuous speciality, than by their prominent and intense devotion to such a study as we have mentioned.

Unhappily the fact differs widely from what might reasonably be expected. It is not merely that those less devout Catholics, whose interest largely centres in worldly affairs, are lukewarm on the matter: this is intelligible enough. But a large proportion (it would seem) of devout and interior persons—persons at the same time whose intellectual endowments would well qualify them for the study in question—seem to find in it but little interest. We have no wish to exaggerate the evil. A certain portion of the Gospels, comparatively indeed small in extent but immeasurably the most precious of all—we mean the narratives of the Passion—are meditated on with keenest devotion by all pious souls. And yet even this meditation will perhaps bear still richer fruit, with those who make an immediate study and harmony of the Gospel text. We do not indeed forget the circumstance, that the great majority of meditation books are based almost entirely on different facts of our Lord's life; and this fact may almost seem a sufficient refutation of what we have above alleged. Still such meditations—we hope it may not appear invidious to say so—by no means (so far as we can see) supply the desideratum on which we are insisting. In the first place many Catholics, who might pursue a study of the Gospels with most happy results, are not called to the habit of formal and methodical daily meditation. But further and more importantly, there is a great

difference to be noted. Whatever individual mystery of our Lord's life may on any given day be the theme of meditation in one of these books, is not commonly considered at all in reference to other acts and words of our Lord, or to its place in His consecutive history; nor again in that fulness of meaning, which the inspired words recording it may contain. Rather it is contemplated, as it stands out on the surface and as an isolated fact. Very commonly indeed much the larger part of the meditation is occupied with deducing almost arbitrarily, from the proposed mystery, this or that lesson—doubtless most holy lesson—for practical life. And this lesson may very probably be one, which does not at all tend to place our Lord's act or word more vividly and energetically before the mind.* We are very far of course from implying, that the method adopted in meditation books is not the best for obtaining the end aimed at in meditation. On the contrary our argument is strengthened, so far as we admit this. We say that the fruits, derivable from methodically studying our Lord's life, are by no means obtained by merely using one of the many meditation books founded on the successive facts of that life. And this statement only

* Last July, when criticising an earlier volume of F. Coleridge's, we hinted at a similar distinction to that mentioned in the text. "It is easy enough doubtless," we said, "to make our Lord's words texts as it were to a series of sermons: but there is not a sentence of F. Coleridge's which can fairly be called digressive; not a sentence which does not assist in apprehending more fully and precisely what it is which our Blessed Lord is saying" [p. 376 of the present volume.]

becomes more probable in proportion as it is admitted, that the purpose aimed at in meditation is not precisely the same as the purpose aimed at in this particular study.

It would carry us quite too far—though otherwise it would be by no means an unprofitable consideration—if we speculated on the various causes, that may have led to the undesirable result which we lament. But what we have said will make our readers the better understand, why it is that we have expressed ourselves more than once in terms of such intense sympathy with F. Coleridge's enterprise. Even had its execution been less masterly than it is, Catholics would owe him a large debt of gratitude for its conception. In the treatment of his theme as a whole, he purports (if we rightly understand him) to rest his foundation on "all that the evangelists in their narratives, or the Church in her theology, in her history and her devotion, place within our reach, of a kind that can illustrate the Economy of the Incarnation" (i. 15). He then further purports to build a superstructure on that foundation, through help of every resource which has been furnished, whether by the pious contemplation of Catholic ascetics,—or by the labours of Catholic commentators,—or by that specially important fact the growth of modern criticism,—or by the valuable data which abound in modern books of travel as to the religious opinions, the domestic habits, the political condition, the physical circumstances of contemporary Palestine—or in one word by every possible instrument within his reach. As the result of this

widely-extended and arduous labour, he aims at achieving a result, which would far more than repay any imaginable amount of such labour. He proposes to take his readers as it were by the hand, and lead them to contemplate our Lord's recorded acts and words as living and breathing facts; to apprehend them moreover, not only as they are in themselves, but in their mutual interdependence and connection. And we say confidently, that even if F. Coleridge's actual achievements in the field he has chosen were less signal than they most certainly are—he would still have rendered a service of momentous importance, by urgently calling the attention of Catholics to the existence and great productiveness of that field.

III.

On former occasions we have expressed our humble judgment, in regard to the three volumes of our Lord's "public life" which have successively appeared. Over and above the immense value of his ideal, we consider that he has wrought *towards* that ideal with signal success. But the very completeness with which he has done his work brings with it an incidental disadvantage. It is no doubt a most important study to contemplate our Lord's acts and words one by one: but it is no less important to contemplate His life *as a whole;* the organic connection of one part with another; the special characteristics of each successive period. Now F. Coleridge's exposition of the Gospel

text is so complete and full, that had he continued simply on his original plan, it is impossible to say for how long a period this *second* part of his subject would have had to be deferred. We think therefore that he has been excellently advised, in breaking through the continuousness of his course, by at once setting forth his reasoned view of our Lord's history as a whole. This cannot of course as yet be done by any means so thoroughly, as will be possible when his detailed exposition of the Gospels shall have come to an end. We may add that the present volumes would in many passages be more intelligible as to their arrangement, if they could have been preceded or accompanied by a more full and minute examination of each Gospel severally than has been possible in the Preface. Something of this kind has been done, in some articles which F. Coleridge has contributed to the "Month" on the structure of S. Matthew: but each Evangelist requires separate and similar treatment. Still, after every reasonable deduction, it remains true that the invaluable materials, which F. Coleridge has collected during years of patient labour and thought, can *at once* with extreme usefulness be exhibited in their general character and bearing. The three volumes already published, on "the public life of Jesus," have sufficiently shown, on what principle F. Coleridge would deal with our Lord's acts and words *individually*. But it was still needed that his readers should understand, how he would deal with the assemblage of those words and acts *as a whole*.

Now to set forth this, is simply in other words to

construct *a harmony*. The study of our Lord's life is invested on one hand with quite peculiar attractiveness, but, on the other hand also with quite peculiar difficulty, by the character of the primary sources from which it is derived. Those sources (we need not say) are four distinct compositions, written each with its own peculiar purpose; each with its own inimitable beauty and unity; no one of which expresses its author's knowledge of other equally authoritative compositions, nor (still less, of course), any account of his own intended *relation* to those compositions. Among many most striking coincidences between these compositions, there are not so very few details in them which on the surface seem mutually contradictory: though the more carefully the Gospels are studied, the more unmistakable becomes the profound harmony and essential unity of them all.* The Catholic knows

* "The four Evangelists may not inaptly be compared to four artists, seated at different points of view, yet all engaged on sketching the same magnificent building. No two of the sketches will be exactly alike, and yet, if all the artists are equally accurate, all will be true pictures of the building. Only those who are intimately acquainted with the building will be able to see clearly how the apparent differences are to be reconciled; and each sketch will have its own peculiar beauties, its own characteristics, arising from the special style of the artist and his particular point of view, and these peculiarities will have their own special value, quite apart from the reconciliation of the differences. So with the four inspired artists who have portrayed for us the Life of our Lord. The knowledge of the divine original, obtained by meditation and prayer, enables us to escape from the perplexities which thicken around the irreverent or sceptical student of Scripture. But it is not enough to escape being perplexed by the apparent

of course, that there is no real contradiction, even the slightest, between these compositions; that they are divinely inspired; that every statement they contain is literally true, in the sense which the author intended. On the other hand "this Christian belief does not preclude the influence of other more natural elements in the case of the Evangelists. It does not shut out the individual character, or the personal experience, or the acquired knowledge, or the turn of mind, or the habit of thought, or the kind of education or association, or the methods of expression, the peculiar tastes or imagery, the natural and cultivated modesty or reserve or simplicity or picturesqueness, which might have distinguished the same authors if they had produced books which were merely human in every respect" (Preface, p. xvi.). But these pregnant principles being assumed, much still remains behind. We may take one or two obvious instances out of a large number, as to the *kind* of questions which have to be considered. Thus—what is the degree of accuracy, with which the Evangelists purport to relate our Lord's discourses? It is plain that they did *not* purport to convey in every instance His "ipsissima verba"; because, even assuming that He spoke in Greek, there are verbal differences of a more or less minute kind, in the respective reports of what were

discrepancies. We wish to note these differences, and reverently to seek out their cause. And in doing so new beauties of the glorious Original will open before us, and a new insight into the scope and intention of each sacred writer will give zest to our investigations."—From an admirable criticism of F. Coleridge in the "Tablet."

indubitably identical discourses. Again—what authority is possessed by the *order* of the Gospels? In what cases, if in any, is it to be assumed that this was strictly chronological? And many other similar inquiries may be named, which must be answered one way or other, if the student is to grasp our Lord's life as a connected whole. For many years, F. Coleridge has given his mind carefully and perseveringly to such questions. So far as having mastered the literature of the subject goes, there can be no second opinion as to his eminent qualifications. A Catholic critic has most truly said, that "the thoughtful student will be surprised at the amount of learning and research so modestly concealed in these notes and prolegomena." But he has brought to his task other qualifications, even far more important than learning. Especially we may mention a certain reverential tact and sagacity —resulting, (one may think), on the one hand from long and minute meditation on the Gospel text; on the other hand from intellectual gifts of a very rare and choice order;—which places his mind in exquisite harmony with the great facts treated by him, and gives indefinitely greater value to his decisions, than could be claimed by mere erudition.

We need hardly say that, within the limits of an article, we can do no more than give brief samples of the way in which F. Coleridge treats his subject. But we will take such a case as the following, which, in some sense may be called critical. It is one, which by no means rarely occurs, and which (as it happens) involves both the two questions above instanced. Two

narrations, identical with each other in a great number of particulars though not in all, are found in two respective Evangelists: one recorded as though referring to one part of our Lord's life, and another to another. On what principle is the harmony of these two narrations to be arranged? Shall they be referred to one event in our Lord's life or to two? F. Coleridge almost invariably gives the *latter* answer. The principle on which he does so is to our mind most undeniably true; and, if admitted, it throws a flood of light on the whole structure of the Gospels. The author states it as follows:—

"One of the most dangerous rocks against which a Harmonist ought to be warned, is the supposition that is at all unlikely that our Lord said and did the same things over and over again in different places during the course of His three years' Ministry. That supposition is in itself obviously and grossly unreasonable. No persons in the world, except perhaps the physicians, are so constantly in the habit of repeating their own words, answering questions and difficulties over and over again, giving the same directions and using the same illustrations and enforcing the same maxims, as those whose Apostolical calling lays upon them the happy but most laborious work of following the great Physician of souls in the exercises of His Missionary Life.

"There is every possible reason for thinking that the discourses and actions of our Lord, especially His miracles, were very constantly the same almost in every feature. The same may be said of the opposition with which He was received, the objections made to His teaching, the cavils against His conduct, the calumnies against His Life. The effect of this consideration on

the decisions which the Harmonist has to make is easily stated. He must be very much on his guard against the temptation to identify similar actions and anecdotes and sayings, in the face of even slight but decided indications of variety in the external circumstances. Such slight indications are generally the notes by which the Evangelists give us to understand that they are not speaking of the same occurrence" (Preface, pp. xlvi.–xlviii.).

Indeed it is most certain that there is very close similarity between *acts* of our Lord, and not merely words or sayings, which are incontestably distinct: as in His miraculously feeding the multitude. F. Coleridge excellently observes (ii. 164), that "if one Evangelist had related the feeding of the five thousand, and one other the feeding of the four thousand, certain critics would have declared that there was but one miracle, and that the Evangelists had been at fault as to the number of the people and the loaves."

On this principle our author explains the many resemblances, between the Sermon on the Mount recorded by S. Matthew, and the Sermon on the Plain recorded by S. Luke. And he signalizes an evil of no small magnitude, which results in this and other analogous cases, from identifying utterances of our Lord, which are in fact distinct. We italicise a few of his words, that our readers may specially observe their force and significance.

"In the case of the supposition that the discourses were really two, we have our Lord Himself varying the expressions, and not only the expressions, but in some instances the points of doctrine themselves which

He puts forth to two different audiences. In each case we have what He said, and we have the additional lesson which is conveyed in the manner in which under different circumstances and at a different time He varied the points which He urged upon His hearers. In the other hypothesis we have the same discourse, but it is applied by the two several Evangelists (though they are still supposed to consider the audience and the occasion the same in our Lord's Life) to the readers to whom their two several Gospels are addressed. That is, instead of a sermon mainly the same, but preached by our Lord to different people and varied by His compassionate prudence according to what He knew of the needs of His several audiences, we have in fact *two versions or representations of the same words by different Evangelists for the purposes of their own readers.* In the one case the words are in both Sermons accurately reported, and *come straight from our Lord;* in the other *they are two different versions of the same words,* all the differences between which do not come from Him.

"It will at all events be allowed, that there should be some very good and urgent reason for our acceptance of a theory as to the reports of our Lord's words, which would thus put us, as it were, at *a greater distance from Him*" (Preface, pp. li., lii.).

The same fundamental principle of harmony is adopted in the little work, which we have named in company with F. Coleridge's at the head of our article: a work which, while unpretending in form, is evidently the fruit of mature learning and thought. As regards e.g. the Sermons on the Mountain and the Plain, they are inserted as separate discourses in pp. 26 and 39 respectively.

At the same time F. Coleridge by no means pushes his principle to a violent and uncompromising extreme. Here is an instance of what we mean. S. Matthew inserts in the midst of the Galilean ministry (viii. 19–22) two incidents, mentioned by him in immediate succession: that of the scribe who sought to follow our Lord,—and of the disciple who asked first to go and bury his father, before joining the holy company. S. Luke (ix. 57–62) mentions these incidents successively in quite another part of his narrative; viz. where he speaks of our Lord as on His way towards Jerusalem. And he subjoins a third incident, similar in character to the two others, not mentioned by S. Matthew. F. Coleridge however does not consider, that the respective narrations of S. Matthew and S. Luke refer in fact to two different groups of events: but to one and the same. On this view, the first of these events certainly happened at the time to which S. Luke refers it; because he expressly says so (ix. 57). As to the second of the two, F. Coleridge inclines to think that it happened at the period to which it appertains in S. Matthew.

"The reason for putting them together is obvious. Here we should have lost instead of gaining, by a strict adherence on the part of the Evangelists to the chronological order. It is only going a step further to suppose that the Evangelists thought that it was important that such words of our Lord should be preserved, but that in what particular connection they were inserted was unimportant. In S. Matthew they are placed where our Lord is going to pass over the lake, and we know that that voyage really took place after the first

teaching by parables. In S. Luke they are placed at the outset of the period of which we are speaking, when our Lord was leaving Galilee. At either time it was natural that such applications should be made. If one were made at one time, and another at another, either Evangelist might suit his own arrangement by placing the two or the three together at either point" (ii. 62, 63).

Our other author here takes a more stringent view, and recites S. Luke's three incidents as altogether distinct from S. Matthew's two. For ourselves, we cannot but think, with F. Coleridge, that this arrangement unnecessarily involves the narrative in serious difficulty.

On one harmonistic detail, we find ourselves in unwilling opposition to *both* our authors: we refer to the healing of the blind men near Jericho (Matt. xx. 29—34; Mark x. 46—52; Luke xviii. 35—43). And as this particular case is always placed in the very front ground by those who deny the entire accuracy of the Evangelists, it will perhaps be permissible to speak of it more at length. It seems to us then with very great deference, that F. Coleridge has not here met the precise difficulty. It is probable enough, as he says (ii. 166), "that two or two dozen blind men were sitting begging at or near the gates of Jericho, by which the pilgrims on their road to Jerusalem for the Pasch passed in or out of the city." What we find extremely hard of belief is, that—whereas the disciples on their road to Jericho had been in some sense reproved by our Lord for rebuking the blind

man's clamour—they should so very soon afterwards repeat the very same offence; and that too under circumstances precisely similar, which must have forcibly reminded them of the previous event. Now we do not think that so harsh a supposition is at all necessitated by S. Luke's language.

We see no reason then whatever for assuming, that S. Luke intended his verse 38 to succeed immediately verse 37 in order of time. On one hand F. Coleridge himself admits, that there is an interval of forty days between Luke xxiv. verses 43 and 44 (see ii. 435, 439): a fact which may surely be taken as exemplifying the Evangelist's occasional modus loquendi. And on the other hand (as we shall presently explain) S. Luke's words taken by themselves rather point to the interpretation which we ourselves prefer. We suggest then (as so many commentators have substantially suggested, Maldonatus in their number) the following conjectural scene. The first blind man, sitting at the entrance of Jericho and hearing a multitude pass by, is told in answer to his inquiries that this is Jesus of Nazareth. On mastering this intelligence, he cries for help;* but by this time the crowd has swept on, and our Blessed Lord, Who sees the future, at this moment makes no response. On learning however that Jesus tarries for a brief space with Zaccheus, our blind man proceeds to join a fellow-sufferer, Bar-Timæus (Mark x. 46). He stations himself in his company where Bar-Timæus is in the habit of sitting

* We do not refer to *this* cry as the one of verse 38.

at the exit of Jericho, and informs him Whom they are to expect. These are the two blind men of Matt. xx. 30. After some delay, Jesus approaches; the two cry aloud for aid; the front rank of the multitude rebuke them for their clamour; but Jesus calls them to Him and heals them.

We submit firstly, that this conjectural scene is in full harmony with everything which S. Luke says. But we submit secondly—as has been ingeniously urged by a Protestant critic—that in one respect it is *more* simply in harmony with S. Luke's language than is the other interpretation. For *who* is it, according to S. Luke, who rebuke the blind man? The *front-rank* of the crowd (verse 39). The blind man then was in *front* of the multitude which accompanied Jesus; and the cry for mercy therefore, which S. Luke records, cannot have been uttered while Jesus was in the very act of passing by. On the other hand it is surely natural enough, that S. Luke, having begun his narration of the anecdote, should prosecute it to its end before mentioning what happened in the interval.

It will have been observed, that we consider S. Luke to have been silent in ch. xviii. on the interval of time which elapsed between his verse 37 and verse 38. In like manner (as we have already urged) he undeniably preserves an equally profound silence on the interval of time which elapsed in his twenty-fourth chapter, either between verses 43 and 44, or (as we prefer to think) verses 45 and 46. But these are only isolated instances of a very large and pervasive fact: viz. the

very remarkable *silences* of the Evangelists. Nothing e.g. can possibly be clearer—we should say with F. Coleridge—to those who carefully study S. John, than that he wrote as intending to supplement his predecessors. Yet he is profoundly silent on this intention; while on the other hand those whom he supplements are equally silent, as to there being such gaps in the narrative as those which he fills up. Going to another matter—no Christian can possibly suppose that S. Luke was ignorant of the great post-Resurrection Galilean manifestation. Yet not only he altogether ignores it, but the more obvious inference from his text would be, that no such manifestation took place.

In regard to this particular fact, we have urged, in previous numbers, an argument of which we may here remind our readers. We have argued, that no objection can with any show of plausibility be devised (in addressing Christians) from the silence of an Evangelist; because Christians know that the Evangelists were *inspired*. When I am dealing with merely human writers, I can often reasonably derive an argument of strong probability from their silence. I know in large measure the motives which can possibly have influenced them; and I may infer with great probability, that there was no reason which could have induced them to be silent on some given fact, had they known it. But I know no more than an infinitely small portion of the Holy Ghost's possible "motives." And I cannot therefore reasonably draw any conclusion as even faintly probable, from the mere *silence* of an *inspired*

writer. But on one occasion we asked also a preliminary question.

"We would ask—do not the special literary characteristics of the present time lead a Christian inquirer to imagine a difficulty in the Gospels, which does not exist? Putting aside all reference to *inspiration*—was it an improbable thing, that such persons as S. Matthew, S. Mark, S. Luke, and S. John should each content himself with recording those facts which specially suited his own purpose? Was it an improbable thing, that no one among them should have contemplated the more ambitious project, of exhibiting our Lord's life as a whole, with due proportion of constituent parts? Or conversely. Would their contemporaries have naturally inferred, from the silence of this or that Evangelist on some one even extremely important fact, that he was *ignorant* of that fact? Is not such an inference rather the inference of a modern critic, than the inference which would have been drawn by a contemporary reader?"*

F. Coleridge has some very apt remarks to a somewhat similar effect:—

"Here, however, we must take into consideration the danger of transferring the common habits of thought of times like our own to the very different habits of generations so far removed from us in so many ways as that to which the Evangelists belonged. We live in the midst of a multitudinous literature, of which the most rare and costly productions are more within the reach of every one, than was the case with the commonest books in the time of the early Church. The writer of any book on any subject has not only to make himself acquainted with the works of others on

* [This passage occurs in an article which I have not reprinted.]

that subject, but he must expect also that his own readers are acquainted with them as well as himself. He must thus take note of points of collision or contact; at least, even if he resolves, for reasons of his own, to decline controversy, he cannot let himself seem to contradict writers whom he holds in reverence without affording his readers the means of explaining the apparent difficulty for themselves. But the age in which the Evangelists lived and wrote was no age for foot-notes, or illustrations, or dissertations appended to the text. The need for these things had not been created by the multiplicity of books and the general habit of reading" (i. 52).

Our author applies this principle, in interpreting the supplementary narration of S. John on one part of the Passion. And to our mind this passage is so important in its bearing on the *whole* Gospel History, that we will quote it entire:—

"The whole passage in S. John is supplementary, like all the rest of his account of what took place in the Passion of our Lord. He wishes to supply two new pieces of information at the same time. One of these pieces relates to our Lord, and the other to S. Peter. S. John joins them together because he is here supplementing the other Evangelists, who have joined the two together—that is, the taking of our Lord to Caiaphas and the entrance of S. Peter into the court. All through his account of the Passion, as for instance when he speaks of the coming of Judas, or of S. Peter's attack on Malchus, or of the leading of our Lord to the Governor, or of His scourging, he begins by taking, as it were, a text from the former Evangelists, to which he then adds information of his own. Here he has to tell us of our Lord's first examination, and of the blow on the cheek which He received, and

he has also to tell us how it was that S. Peter gained admission to the court of the High Priest's palace, and so indirectly to explain how it was that he came to be attacked by the servant-girl as he sat by the fire. The story might thus be told by a modern writer:—

"'It has been stated already, as the reader knows, that our Lord was taken by His captors to the palace of Caiaphas the High Priest, and that S. Peter followed Him, and gained admission to the court, where he was challenged by the servant-girl, and denied his Master. There are two things to be added to this account. In the first place, our Lord was taken to Annas, the father-in-law of Caiaphas, who was the High Priest of that year, and had given the advice to the Jews that it was well that one man should die for the nation. In the second place, there was another disciple as well as S. Peter who gained admission into the palace of the High Priest. This one was well known to the High Priest, and so was admitted at once, and when he saw S. Peter outside, trying to get in, he went and spoke to the maid at the door, and thus it was that S. Peter obtained admission. This was the maid who charged S. Peter with being, like the other, one of the disciples of our Lord—for S. Peter not only went in, but stood by the fire warming himself with the servants and officers. Now, as to the first point, which relates to our Lord Himself. The High Priest began to question Him as to His disciples and His doctrine, and when our Lord answered that He had always taught openly, and that anything He had said might be made matter of evidence against Him by those who had heard Him, but it was not well to ask Him to accuse Himself, He received a rude, savage blow on the cheek from one of the servants for answering the High Priest in such a manner. Our Lord calmly expostulated with the striker of the blow, who might have borne witness against Him if He had said anything

amiss, but who did wrong to strike Him. This is what passed at that first examination. Now as to the second point. Annas sent our Lord as a prisoner to Caiaphas, and, as was said just now, Peter, having obtained admission in the way mentioned already into the court of the High Priest's house, was standing and warming himself. It had also been mentioned that his mode of entrance had excited the suspicion of the servant-girl who kept the door, and thus it was that the first charge against him was made by her. Then they charged him again, and he denied again, and the third time he denied in the same way, having been accused of being in the garden by a servant who was a near kinsman of Malchus, whose ear he had there cut off.'

"This is perhaps the way in which the story would have been told by a writer of our time. But it would not differ in anything from the account of S. John, except in the addition of a few connecting and explanatory particles" (ii. pp. 387, 8).

We are thus brought to the threshold of a further inquiry. We have said that something of this kind occurs again and again. Two incidents in our Lord's life, closely resembling each other but yet distinct, are recorded by two different Evangelists. It hardly ever happens however, that *the same* Evangelist recounts *both* these incidents.* How is this last circumstance to be explained? F. Coleridge replies by a theory, which he has long and consistently held, and which he applies with great power in a large number of different ways. He considers that each Evangelist

* We call to mind no exception to this remark, except the two feedings of the multitude.

was well acquainted with the previous Gospels. Accordingly, in his view, S. Luke e.g. purposely omits some narrative which S. Matthew has given, and inserts instead some very similar but distinct event which S. Matthew has omitted. Without pretending to any confident opinion on this matter, we may nevertheless venture to say that F. Coleridge has not (so far as we see) given his mind fully to one argument, prominently adduced by those who differ from him. It might seem to follow from his view, that in the numerous cases where the same event is recorded by the three Synoptists with some slight difference of wording, the later Evangelists have been sitting in judgment on the preceding Gospels, and have altered their phraseology for some definite reason. This supposition would involve much difficulty; as we could show if our space permitted us to give instances. But at last perhaps F. Coleridge's theory does not require him to make it. Still on this point, for our own part, we are rather inclined to follow our second author; who thinks that no one of the Synoptists "took account in his composition of what the other had written" (p. xv.). And at all events we doubt not F. Coleridge would himself say, that the traditional oral teaching counted for more with each Evangelist, than did the antecedent Gospels.

If we be asked how, *except* on F. Coleridge's theory, that general feature of the Gospel history can be explained to which we above refer—our own bias would be of the following kind. The Evangelists were entrusted with what in some sense may be called the

most sacred commission ever assigned to men,* that of narrating the human utterances and actions of Almighty God. As F. Coleridge constantly reminds us, it is comparatively a very small part of these utterances and actions, which have been placed on record; and these had to be selected from an indefinite multitude. We cannot think it unreasonable to suppose, that the work of inspiration would be (if we may so express ourselves) more prominent and active in these than in other books of Scripture; and that a direct suggestion was given to each Evangelist, as to what selection of facts was marked out for him by the Holy Ghost.

Our second author however certainly goes farther on this head than we can follow him; for he accounts it doubtful (p. xv.) whether even S. John took account of his predecessors. To our mind the internal evidence tells most strongly in the opposite sense. In those comparatively few portions of his history which are occupied with events narrated in the other Gospels, his purpose has every appearance of being supplementary to theirs; and he gives prominence to different incidents.

We are thus led to another cognate particular. F. Coleridge throughout draws a much more prominent distinction than is commonly done, between S. Luke and his two predecessors: both as regards the general purpose or character of his work, and as regards the

* We set forth more fully what we here mean in July, 1875, and October, 1876. [See pp. 345, 391 of this volume.]

scene of the events which he records.* We are disposed to follow our author in both these particulars; and at all events we follow him with considerable confidence on the latter. He mentions in his Preface (p. lv.) that this is in some sense the most original part of his structure. He considers (ii. 23) that "more than half the chapters which S. Luke devotes to the Ministry of our Lord are taken up with a period, of which the earlier Evangelists say hardly anything." And in pp. 53 et seq. he gives with some detail his reasons, for his view as to what happened during this period. He holds that, during the interval covered by those chapters, our Lord was preaching throughout Judæa, just as in the earlier period He was preaching throughout Galilee; that in Judæa, just as previously in Galilee, He organized and trained a permanent body of disciples; though no doubt that organization and training would be less complete, from the circumstance that His preaching in Judæa must have been of shorter duration than in Galilee. F. Coleridge bases his argument on the fact, indubitably declared by S. Peter (Acts x. 37), that our Lord did at some time or other preach "through all Judæa"; and if so, it is difficult even to suggest any

* Partly perhaps for this reason, F. Coleridge never uses the word "Synoptic," so frequently employed by modern critics to denote the three earlier Gospels. He suggests indeed a different phrase (i. 105). He calls the three first Gospels "historical," in contradistinction to S. John's which is "doctrinal." We confess we are not quite attracted by this terminology. It seems to us, that the more obvious antithesis to "historical" would be "mythical."

possible date for the fact, except for the very one in question. He supplements this argument "by the aid of internal evidence. This evidence is of different kinds and various degrees of conclusiveness; but," as he truly observes, "when many such arguments converge, it is difficult to resist their force" (p. 53). We must say that he carries us along with him entirely, in the whole of this masterly discussion.

Here by the way is the solution of a difficulty, which we have often thought that harmonists treat somewhat too lightly: we mean the second promulgation of the Lord's Prayer (Luke xi. 1 et seq.). It seemed hard to understand, how that prayer, when once taught, can have been otherwise than in daily use among the disciples; and how they could possibly therefore have again asked Him to teach them to pray. But His disciples here mentioned were—as regards the enormous majority—a different body altogether from those addressed in Galilee; and may well therefore have been ignorant of the Prayer.

All that we have been saying converges in some sense on a logically prior question: What was the exact origin of the Four Gospels? How shall we account at once for their striking coincidences and their striking divergencies? There is hardly any question, which has so harassed modern critics as this; but by degrees general consent seems settling down on some such view of the matter as F. Coleridge gives. The question is so fundamental, that we are sure our readers will be glad of a long extract:—

"It is obvious on the face of the question, that the four Gospels do not profess to give us a complete view, even of that comparatively small part of our Lord's earthly existence to which they refer. It may also be considered as a matter on which scholars are agreed, that in a certain sense 'the Gospel' existed before it was written. When S. Paul, in his second Epistle to the Corinthians, spoke of S. Luke—as it is commonly thought—as the 'brother whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the churches,' he probably wrote before what we now have as the Gospel of S. Luke existed in its present form. Whether or not it was the special office of those whom he speaks of in another Epistle as 'evangelists,' and of whom the deacon Philip was one, to relate and comment upon the incidents of our Lord's life and His carefully recorded sayings, it is clear that there must have been from the earliest days some such office and some such teaching, on which the practical system of Christian morality, the imitation of the virtues of our Lord considered as our great Example, and the following out of His peculiar precepts and counsels of perfection, must have been built. The Epistles of the Apostles evidently suppose a large range of practical, we may surely say catechetical teaching of this kind, and the basis on which this must have been built must have been the substance of our Gospels. It is not straining conjecture too far to suppose that something of this kind formed a considerable part of that 'ministry of the word' to which, together with prayer, the Apostles mainly devoted themselves in the infant Church at Jerusalem. But the existence and daily application of teaching of this kind, which embodied in so large a measure the acts and sayings of our Blessed Lord during the time which He had spent, more or less, in the company of the Apostles, must of necessity have led in the course of time to the forma-

tion of some authentic manuals, as we should call them, on the subject. At first no doubt the Apostles would themselves be the chief instructors, and their memories, aided by the promised assistance of the Holy Ghost, would secure that faithfulness and uniformity in the relation of what our Lord had said and done and commanded, which the importance of the subject-matter required. In process of time, and indeed very shortly, others would have to be employed in the same work.

"But further, it would be altogether contrary to the spirit of the Christian system, that this most important sphere should have been left to unauthorized teachers or to hazards of human minds and memories. It is probable that long before the Apostles separated, as the preaching of the Gospel spread from city to city and from land to land, this teaching concerning our Blessed Lord would have become fixed, regulated, and recorded. This may be considered as the nucleus of what we now call the Gospel history. Even before it was committed to writing, it would take shape and form and character, according to the persons who were its authoritative exponents, and the spiritual needs, or even the controversial position, or again the national and social peculiarities, of the community to which it was addressed" (pp. xii.–xiv.).

In full accordance with this general view, F. Coleridge expresses another particular, which is very important for a critical apprehension of the Gospels :—

"It is by no means inconsistent either with reverence to the Evangelists or with the probabilities of the case, that the materials out of which the Gospels were framed existed in detached pieces before they were united. In the earliest of the Gospels—that is, as we believe, in that of S. Matthew—we have frequent traces of the separate existence of the several portions

which he has arranged with so much care and skill. He usually begins a new paragraph with the word τότε, then, as he would probably have begun the relation of the miracles or the parables or the anecdotes when he was expounding them to his hearers in the Church at Jerusalem. There are traces of the same feature in S. Mark and in S. Luke; and in S. John's Gospel, which is nothing but a succession of fragments, as we might call them, the same principle of division may be observed, though his divisions are fewer and larger than those of the others. The language and style of the several Evangelists are quite sufficiently their own to enable us to feel sure that every word in every Gospel comes straight from the author whose name that Gospel bears; although there are passages—as in the early chapters of S. Luke—*where they seem to be clothing in a very transparent veil the information which has come to them from others.* But this general principle, as to the original form in which a great part of the Gospels may have existed, is especially to be kept in mind as an answer to a great number of difficulties which arise as to order and connection. It stands to reason, that in books thus composed there will be apparent an abruptness of transition, or a want of perfect dovetailing, which is no fault of the writers, and by which critics may often be misled" (pp. xxxix., xl.).

We have italicised one clause, which manifestly refers to the place occupied by our Blessed Lady in originating the Gospel Tradition.

IV.

We now pass, from the *principles* on which the Gospel narrative should be constructed, to the *contents*

of that construction itself. It is obvious, as F. Coleridge remarks (Preface, p. xxxiv.), that this "can only be a very inadequate representation of what" our Lord's "life truly was." It may be said perhaps with an approximation to truth, that the Evangelists confined themselves to a selection from those acts and words of our Lord, which might be made a matter of fruitful meditation to Christians of every period. Thus on the one hand, as F. Coleridge points out (p. xxxiv.), "our Lord must have given the Apostles a great deal of instruction about the Church, the Sacraments, and other similar subjects," on which the Gospels are silent. But then such instructions are rather important to Christians as regards their *result*, than as regards our Lord's method of imparting them; and are therefore omitted. On the other hand (as we have urged on more than one previous occasion) if Mary be really what Catholics believe—if she belong to a sphere entirely removed above the apprehensions of ordinary men—it follows that the notion of recording for future ages her colloquies with her Son would be simply wild and extravagant. As well might one think of unfolding to mortal men the conversation of angels in heaven. We cannot wonder then, that the Gospels "tell us nothing" of the intercourse between Him and "the one heart which understood Him and loved Him and was loved by Him more than all" (ii. 214). On the same principle perhaps may be explained another circumstance, to which F. Coleridge draws attention: the very observable silence of the Gospels on our Lord's words during the great Forty

Days. Those words would probably refer in large measure to ecclesiastical principles, which the faithful were to learn from the Church's practical teaching; and to which our Blessed Lord's actual words would perhaps communicate no special force or impressiveness. On the other hand the great miracle of the Resurrection must, when fully apprehended, have given the Apostles a certain marvellous elevation of thought, which made them perhaps fit recipients for a body of communications, quite above the apprehension of the ordinary Christian.*

From what has been said it follows, that the first thirty years of our Lord's life might have been expected to occupy indefinitely less space in the Gospels, than the three years of His public ministry. These thirty years constitute the first of the periods into which His history is naturally divided; and the following general remarks on this period are worthy of devout and deep meditation :—

"It is of immediate importance that we should remark that these mysteries, which are as true and as actual, so to speak, as any of the simply external doings or sufferings of our Blessed Lord, belong almost entirely to that spiritual order which underlies all the incidents and vicissitudes of His Life. The choice and preparation of Mary, her Immaculate Conception, the endowment of her soul at its first dawn of life with spiritual graces which surpassed the attainments of the

* F. Coleridge mentions one ancient interpretation of John xxi. 25, which understands the Evangelist as there saying, that there are many of our Lord's unrecorded sayings, which the world would be unable to *apprehend*.

highest angels—or again, the whole spiritual history of the Sacred Humanity of our Lord, or of His chosen servants, S. Joseph and S. John, the interior Life of the Sacred Heart in the womb of His Mother, its intense and unceasing activity in the love of God and man, or the same Life as continued after His Birth, through the thirty years of the Hidden Life—all these and other facts like them belong in great measure to that unseen world, which is worth far more in the sight of heaven than anything material or, as we call it, historical, in a merely human sense. These things belong, indeed, to the great Counsel of God as unfolded in prophecy, and touch here and there upon the ordinary levels of history in their fulfilment of that manifold anticipation and promise of which they were the subject. But what meets the eye in all these mysteries is comparatively trifling and slender. The spirits of heaven gazed with that intense eagerness of desire and wonder of which S. Peter speaks, on the simple incidents the chain of which we are to try to draw out, but they could read beneath the surface, and understand better than the most illuminated of earthly theologians the great part of God in what seemed outwardly so wanting in significance. But the Evangelical narrative begins, indeed, with a grand declaration of the Eternal Godhead and Sonship of Him Who became Man for us, a declaration which sums up the theology of the Church as to the Person of Christ; and then it follows the external and human incidents, *which were the mask, as it may be called, of truths which are left unspoken*. The uninstructed reader might almost follow its details without more suspicion of what lay behind them than was felt by the busy worldlings of Bethlehem or the proud ecclesiastics at Jerusalem. Great as are the manifestations of our Lord, even in the mysteries of His Infancy, they do not strike upon

the eye except of such as those who were watching for the salvation of Israel" (i. 23, 4).

For want of a more appropriate opportunity, we may here draw attention to F. Coleridge's rationale of S. Matthew's various quotations from the Old Testament. There is no particular in the Gospels, of which more vigorous use is made by any one who desires to disparage their authority. F. Coleridge writes as follows :—

"To him the whole of Scripture and all the history of mankind, and especially of the chosen people, is one great prophecy of Jesus Christ. This truth involves a further truth—that of the many kinds and varieties of prophecy, which is at some times and in some cases more direct and formal than in others. The references in S. Matthew's Gospel to types and anticipations of incidents relating to our Lord's Person are sometimes tacit, and do not always lie on the surface. When he makes a direct application of a text, or of a series of texts, it is not always necessary that the words which he quotes, or to which he refers, should have no other more immediate reference than that which he draws from them. If the whole history of the chosen people, for instance, was ordered as it was ordered in reference to the Incarnation, then the calling of the Israelites out of Egypt, and the incidents which made the mothers of Rama wail for their children, were in themselves prophecies of our Lord. But we must not here enlarge on the subject of S. Matthew's use of prophecy in its largest sense. It is enough to point out that those mysteries of our Lord's Childhood which he selects are introduced by him with the most direct purpose of eliciting from them instances of the argument from prophecy, which must have been so familiar to himself and the other Apostles in their first

disputes with the Jews or their first instructions to Christians" (i. 44).

As regards the events following our Lord's Nativity, we entirely go along with F. Coleridge: and so also does our second author, as far as he expresses himself. In truth, not only we have always thought the arrangement given by him the only satisfactory one, but we are disposed to agree with him (i. 56) that "the question is not difficult to settle"; though it has given rise no doubt to interminable discussions. There is not the slightest reason to infer from S. Matthew's narrative, that the visit of the Magi took place immediately after the Nativity. Indeed both ii. 11 and ii. 16 would rather point to a different conclusion: for (1) our Lord and His Mother were now in a "house"; and (2) the date of our Lord's birth, which Herod learned from the wise men, led him to massacre all the infants under two years old. As F. Coleridge well argues, even if the ecclesiastical observance of the Epiphany points to an authentic anniversary (which is very doubtful), the visit of the Magi might most intelligibly have taken place a year and twelve days, or two years and twelve days, after the Nativity. Then again—unless we give a very forced interpretation to Matt. ii. 22—we must admit that, when the Holy Family returned from Egypt, they looked on the land of Judæa as their natural home. Nor lastly is Luke ii. 39 fairly reconcilable with any hypothesis, implying that they remained for any considerable time in Bethlehem after the Presentation. Everything points to F. Coleridge's inference (i. 58), that "before he

was in any fear from Herod or Archelaus, S. Joseph had moved his residence from Galilee." Nor can any supposition be more natural. For it was to be expected, that a knowledge of the relation in which they were to stand towards the Messias, should in various ways alter the plans of our Lady and S. Joseph.

There are no other harmonistic difficulties as regards our Lord's hidden life. We have already given what seems to us the obvious reason, why so little should be narrated concerning the ineffable colloquies which must have been so frequent, between those three Persons whom devout Catholics delight to designate as "the earthly Trinity." But there is one further question, which we may here touch. It has been held by many Catholics that, during His public ministry, our Lord separated Himself from the company of His Mother; and that, as part of His sufferings, He deprived Himself of the solace He would have derived from her presence. No one will deny that this is a touching and beautiful suggestion; but F. Coleridge does not adopt it. On the contrary he commemorates (i. 11) our Lord's "continuation of His Home Life through the period of His active ministry." And a Protestant commentator has argued with some force, that if such a separation between our Lord and His Mother had then taken place, it would have been at the beginning rather than the end of His ministry that He would have committed her to S. John's care (John xix. 26, 7). Nevertheless on the whole our own bias here is adverse to F. Coleridge's view.*

* [See p. 210 of the present volume.]

V.

As to the public ministry itself, F. Coleridge subdivides that period on a principle, which (so far as we happen to know) is as strikingly original as it is eminently satisfactory. He takes as its first subdivision the time, during which there had been no definite rupture (if we may so express ourselves) between Him and the Jewish rulers. The general characteristics of this time are beautifully set forth in i. 89 et seq. And it is remarkable that, while it lasted, He abstained from definitively instituting the Church's organization, and thus left the matter in some sense open. The attitude however of the Jewish rulers, at this time came to a close, and rendered any further delay of the kind impossible.

"We cannot doubt [says F. Coleridge] that in the Providence of God a way could have been found in which the organization of the new kingdom, with its law, its hierarchy, its sacrifice, its sacraments, and its priesthood, might have seemed to grow out of the Jewish institutions themselves without any violent rupture or antagonism between the ancient and the new dispensations. What use might have been made by our Lord of the ecclesiastical system of Judaism if its rulers had thrown themselves at His feet instead of becoming His persecutors, it is impossible for us to divine. But it is significant that just at the time when their hostility becomes so pronounced and so unscrupulous as to lead to plots and combinations against His life, He seems to take steps which He had not hitherto taken towards the formation of a body or a community

of His own. It is at the point of time which we have now reached that the formal selection of the Twelve Apostles is placed by the Evangelists, and it is clear that from this time up to that of the confession of S. Peter and the promise of the foundation of the Church, our Lord's attention was concentrated in an especial manner and degree upon those who were to become the founders of that Church after Him. A very considerable part of the sayings and teachings of this period was devoted to His Apostles alone, and we shall see that before its close they are sent out to preach in our Lord's name, after very particular instructions from Him, and after having received the gift of miracles in order to authenticate their preaching" (i. 179, 180).

This second period culminated in S. Peter's great confession, and in the Transfiguration: events placed by all three Synoptists in closest juxtaposition; and to which (so far as we happen to know) F. Coleridge is the first harmonist who has given due prominence, as a conspicuous landmark in the history. As to the third subdivision of the public ministry—reaching from S. Peter's confession to the Passion—we cannot do better than quote F. Coleridge's general account of it:—

"We have seen that the positive hostility to our Blessed Lord on the part of the Jewish authorities, which was first manifested in Jerusalem on occasion of His miracle at the Probatic Pool, and afterwards grew into a more malignant persecution in Galilee, was, together with its consequences, the immediate cause of a change in His method of action and teaching, of which change we have had to observe many instances in the history of the second period of His Public Life. In that stage of His teaching which we

are now to consider we find many instances of the same hostile feeling against Him on the part of the authorities, and it is obvious that it only deepened as time went on. But in this third and last period of the Public Life we shall have to remark on further changes in our Lord's manner, which are only partially to be attributed to the attitude of determined hostility towards Him which the Chief Priests at Jerusalem maintained. Another cause, less mournful in character, had its effect now. That cause was the confirmed faith of the Apostles, as expressed in the confession of S. Peter, which closes the second period of His Public Life, and which may be said to have set our Lord free to speak, to them at least directly, and indirectly even to others, of His approaching Passion, and of all that was contained and implied in it, more especially the doctrine of the Church and the outlines of its laws as the new kingdom of God. At the same time we find our Lord no longer avoiding His persecutors as before, but confronting them in Jerusalem itself, not merely at the great Feast of Tabernacles, but at another minor festival, and indeed, as far as we can gather, teaching for a considerable space of time in their immediate neighbourhood, and throughout the towns and villages of Judæa itself, with the same publicity and authority as before in Galilee during the two first years of His Ministry" (ii. 1, 2).

We may here interpose a few words, on an episodical question, not without its interest; a question on which we were very desirous of finding what is F. Coleridge's judgment, because we ventured to offer a short treatment of it a few years ago.* We refer to the identity or non-identity existing between S. Mary

* [See the Seventh Essay in this volume.]

Magdalene, Mary sister of Lazarus, and the peccatrix of Luke vii. 37. We have been much gratified to find, that almost every part of the position we assumed receives F. Coleridge's sanction. Thus (i. 311) he holds that John xi. 2 by itself suffices to establish the identity of Mary of Bethany with the peccatrix. Then as regards the identification of S. Mary Magdalene with Mary of Bethany, the only difficulty lies in the latter not being ever expressly called Magdalene.

"At the same time, it may fairly be argued that this silence is easily explained, and, indeed, that the whole narrative taken together almost if not entirely supplies the absence of the identification by name. The only Evangelist who names Mary the sister of Lazarus as the anointer at Bethany is S. John. If we are asked why he does not call her the Magdalene, and why, on the other hand, he uses the epithet Magdalene when he speaks of the women at the foot of the Cross and when he relates the history of the Resurrection, the answer is at hand. In these two places where he mentions Mary Magdalene there are other Maries, either mentioned by himself, or present to his mind, from whom she was to be distinguished. It is not so in the narrative of the supper at Bethany. It seems to be S. John's way to call her Mary simply, when he can, and only to use the other name, Magdalene, when he is obliged for the sake of distinctness. And in the second place, the history of the supper at Bethany itself is enough to identify Mary the sister of Lazarus with the Mary Magdalene of the Resurrection. For our Lord speaks of the anointing which was then performed as a part of His funeral rites, and bids the disciples let Mary keep what she has done for His burial. These words seem to imply that the Mary of whom our Lord spoke would certainly be foremost in

the endeavours of the holy women His followers to anoint and embalm His Sacred Body, but that she would not be able then to do what she had done at Bethany. It is almost impossible to suppose that this Mary would either have been absent at such a time, or that her presence would not have been noted. But nothing is said in the history of the Resurrection of Mary the sister of Lazarus, unless she be the same person as Mary Magdalene. If she is the same person, then our Lord's words at the supper are easily understood, and the whole history of this devout lover of His becomes complete" (i. 312).

We think that the only point connected with this episode, on which F. Coleridge has come to a different conclusion from our own, is his identifying the "village" of Luke x. 38 with Bethany. On this point also our second author (p. 91) is of the same mind. The matter is of extremely slight importance; but we are still disposed to see preponderating force in the arguments which we adduced on the other side.*

VI.

Our limits here warn us that we draw towards a conclusion. And since we have so recently written on the "Gospel Narrative of the Resurrection," it is an obvious course to occupy our remaining space by briefly considering F. Coleridge's treatment of this theme. Before entering however on this,

* [See pp. 313, 4, of this volume.]

we cannot refrain from earnestly pressing on our readers' attention a singularly beautiful and ascetically practical passage (ii. 293–5), in which our author summarily exhibits "the particular causes and phases" of our Lord's "terrible agony." Every sentence in these pages will be found a fruitful theme for meditation: all the more efficacious, because F. Coleridge so carefully measures his language, and abstains from anything like vague or rhetorical declamation.

Passing on now to the Resurrection,—F. Coleridge does not fail to insist on a matter which we ourselves incidentally mentioned. He points out that "the divinely-appointed evidence as to the Resurrection is altogether independent of" the Gospels (ii. 398). He then thus proceeds:—

"It is true that the Gospels record more than one of the occasions on which our Lord manifested Himself to His Apostles. But their witness was made to all the world long before the Gospels were written. As the Scriptures are the history of Revelation, rather than Revelation itself,—as the Gospels are the records of our Lord's teaching and legislation, rather than that teaching and that legislation themselves,—so in this particular part of their works the Evangelists are the historians of the divinely appointed testimony to the Resurrection of our Lord—they do not themselves furnish that testimony" (ii. 398).

This truth needs to be insisted on again and again at the present day; because the excuse now ordinarily adopted by infidels, for ignoring the absolutely irrefragable historical proof of the Resurrection, is to insist on what they account irreconcilable discrepan-

cies in the Gospel narrative. We have urged on previous occasions that, even if these discrepancies were admitted to be indubitably irreconcilable—a supposition (we need hardly say) remote in the furthest degree from truth—such a fact would not even appreciably weaken the historical certainty of the Resurrection.

It is not controversialists only however, who are tempted to wish that the Gospel narrative of the Resurrection were far fuller and far more obviously intelligible than it is.

"The devout contemplative soul may also complain that, whereas in the other portions of their narratives the Evangelists keep our Lord ever before us as the central figure in the picture—so central and prominent that all others are not merely subordinate to Him, but are actually, so to say, dwarfed by the extent to which He fills the eye—now, that we come to the moment of His triumph, to the gathering in, as it were, of the harvest for which His life and sufferings were the seed-time, He is almost withdrawn from our sight save for occasional visits and manifestations, which do not fill up a tithe even of the short space of time during which we know that He was on earth after He had risen from the dead" (ii. 393, 4).

For our own part indeed we must ever think, that no single portion of the Gospels—not even their narrative of the Passion—contains pictures more exquisitely beautiful and elevating or more fruitful for devotion, than are contained in these concluding chapters. Still it cannot be denied, of course, that the records of the Forty Days, however attractive, are

very scanty. We have already mentioned two not improbable reasons for this circumstance. F. Coleridge, in addition, suggests another of quite a different kind. Had the Gospel narratives of the Resurrection been such as to admit of being raised into an independent proof of that central verity, the Apostolic office would in some sense have been encroached on. This would have been so, because it was Apostles as such, and not Evangelists as such, who were appointed to be authenticating witnesses of the Resurrection (ii. 396, 7).

The harmonistic difficulties of this period refer exclusively to the events which took place on the Day itself of the Resurrection. Without professing here to discuss them—which would carry us quite too far—we will briefly comment on one or two parts of F. Coleridge's exposition.

We incline to think that he is right, in his interpretation (ii. 392) of Matt. xxviii. 1. And though we fancy that the great majority of commentators are on the other side, including perhaps our second author, we believe that Patrizi takes the same view as F. Coleridge. This verse then refers—not to Easter morning—but to the near approach of sunset on Holy Saturday: at which time S. Mary Magdalene and the other Mary paid a visit of devotion to the Holy Sepulchre. This explanation leaves S. Matthew's meaning entirely vague, as to who were the women mentioned by him at verse 5; and how soon they arrived, after the earthquake had taken place, and after the consternation of the guards had left free access to visitors.

Our author's general principles of harmony on the events of Easter Day are thus stated:—

"It may be allowed, however, to think that, the more we separate the several visits to the sepulchre and the several visions of angels, the more nearly we shall approach to the historical truth in this matter. They are like a cluster of islands, which seem to be one to a ship approaching them in a straight line from a distance, which are seen to lie one far behind the other as the same ship passes them. We cannot really be sure that there were not four or five parties of holy women instead of two only. The names which are mentioned in the Gospels may be the names of the chief persons in each. The names which are given in S. Matthew and S. Mark are those of the women who prepared spices and ointments either on the Friday night or on the Saturday night. It is by no means necessary to suppose that when these two Evangelists speak of the women who went to the sepulchre on the Sunday morning, they mean us to understand them to speak just of those women and of no others, or of all those whom they have named as being in one party" (ii. 447).

This view of the case seems to us entirely just, and may be of much use in solving difficulties. Again, F. Coleridge understands Luke xxiv. 10, as we suggested in October*; indeed he had made clear that such was his opinion, in the Latin "Vita Vitæ." S. Luke, he says, in that verse, "gives the names of all who, at different times that morning, gave the Apostles the information as to what they had seen" (p. 447). We mentioned in October the remark of a Protestant com-

* [See p. 416 of this volume.]

mentator, that the change of *tense*, between verses 9 and 10, adds much probability to this interpretation.

On the other hand, F. Coleridge insists on the literal meaning of "orto jam sole" (Mark xvi. 2) which we were disposed to soften;* and our second author agrees with him in this. Our difficulty in this interpretation does not arise from any harmonistic perplexity, but exclusively from S. Mark's own language. We do not see how it is possible to take *both* "orto sole" and "valde mane" in their obvious sense. Certainly, we have not happened to see any instance cited by the advocates of F. Coleridge's view, in which the phrase "λίαν πρωί" refers to so late a period as sunrise; and in i. 35 S. Mark himself uses the phrase of a time when it was yet dark: "πρωὶ ἔννυχα λίαν." However, the difficulty, as we have said, is in no sense harmonistic. If Mark xvi. 2 really refers to sunrise, Greswell's supposition gives an obvious means of reconciling it with John xx. 1. Greswell supposes, that the holy women named by S. Mark had slept at Bethany; that S. John refers to S. Mary Magdalene's time of setting out, and S. Mark to her time of arrival. It may possibly be, as Greswell also suggests, that S. Mark intended elliptically to express *both* times.

We have much difficulty on this particular matter in accepting F. Coleridge's harmony, for the following reason. It is certain from Luke xxiv. 23, that tidings reached the Apostles of an angelic vision, before tidings reached them of our Lord having appeared.

* [See pp. 414, 5, of this volume.]

We cannot see how F. Coleridge's location of our Blessed Lord's interview with S. Mary Magdalene (John xx. 14) and with the other holy women (Matt. xxviii. 9), is consistent with this indubitable fact.

Lastly, we do not think that our author does entire justice to the pre-eminent place occupied by the great Galilean manifestation which S. Matthew records. This manifestation was the only one wherein He appeared to the whole body of His disciples; and it was also the only one which He specially predicted before His Passion.

VII.

However, we need hardly say that, in these as in any other demurs we have made, we speak entirely under correction. We could not feel any kind of confidence in pitting our own judgment on such matters against the decision of one, who has made them the theme of such long-continued study, and who possesses so singularly keen an instinct in this kind of inquiry. Nor can we conclude our imperfect comment, without expressing a sincere hope and prayer, that F. Coleridge may have strength and opportunity for bringing to a completion the great and noble enterprise, which he has so piously and opportunely undertaken.

WYMAN AND SONS, PRINTERS,
GREAT QUEEN STREET, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS,
LONDON, W.C.

152